

**State of California**  
**California Regional Water Quality Control Board**  
**Santa Ana Region**  
**3737 Main Street, Suite 500**  
**Riverside, CA 92501- 3348**

**FACT SHEET**  
**December 10, 2009**

Deleted: August 3

ITEM: 2

**SUBJECT: Waste Discharge Requirements for the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, the County of Riverside, and the Incorporated Cities of Riverside County within the Santa Ana Region, Urban Runoff Management Program, Order No. R8-2009-0033 (NPDES No. CAS 618033)**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

**A. PROJECT**

The attached pages contain information concerning an application for renewal of Waste Discharge Requirements and a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, Order No. R8-2009-0033 (Order), NPDES No. CAS 618033, which prescribes Waste Discharge Requirements for Urban Runoff (as defined in Appendix 4) from the cities and the unincorporated areas in Riverside County within the jurisdiction of the Santa Ana Regional Board Water Quality Control Board (Regional Board). This Order regulates discharges of Urban Runoff from the Permit Area, as defined in Order No. R8-2009-0033 and shown in Appendix 1.

~~Urban Runoff includes those discharges from residential, commercial, industrial, and construction areas within the Permit Area and excludes discharges from feedlots, dairies, farms, and open space. Urban Runoff discharges consist of storm water and authorized non-storm water surface runoff from drainage sub-areas with various, often mixed, land uses within all the hydrologic drainage areas that discharge into the Waters of the U. S.~~

If appropriate Pollution control measures are not implemented, Urban Runoff, (as defined in Appendix 4 – Glossary), may contain pathogens (bacteria, protozoa, viruses), sediment, trash, fertilizers (nutrients, mostly nitrogen and phosphorus compounds), oxygen-demanding substances (decaying matter), pesticides (DDT, chlordane, diazinon, chlorpyrifos), heavy metals (cadmium, chromium, copper, lead, zinc), and petroleum products (oil & grease, PAHs, petroleum hydrocarbons).

Deleted: p

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009

If not properly managed and controlled, urbanization can change the stream hydrology and increase ~~P~~ollutant loading to Receiving Waters. As a watershed undergoes urbanization, ~~pervious surface area decreases, runoff volume and velocity increase,~~ riparian habitats and wetland habitats decrease, the frequency and severity of flooding ~~increase,~~ and ~~P~~ollutant loading increases. Most of these impacts occur due to human activities ~~(Anthropogenic)~~ that occur during and/or after urbanization. The ~~P~~ollutants and hydrologic changes can cause declines in aquatic resources, cause toxicity to aquatic organisms, and impact human health and the environment. Based on information provided in Section D of the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District's (RCFC&WCD or the Principal Permittee as context indicates) Hydrology Manual, it is feasible that, in semi-arid regions, development may result in the creation of a net increase in absorption.

Deleted: p

Deleted: s

Deleted: p

Deleted: a

Deleted: p

Properly planned high-density development can reduce urban sprawl and problems associated with sprawl. Urban in-fill and high-density development are elements of smart growth, which creates the opportunity to maintain relatively natural open space elsewhere in the Permit Area (see Appendix 4). The goal of LID is to mimic pre-development runoff quality and quantity.

On April 27, 2007, The RCFC&WCD in cooperation with the County of Riverside (the County) and the incorporated cities of Beaumont, Calimesa, Canyon Lake, Corona, Hemet, Lake Elsinore, Moreno Valley, Murrieta, Norco, Perris, Riverside, and San Jacinto ~~(hereinafter, with the County, collectively referred to as the Co-Permittees, and collectively, with the Principal Permittee, the Permittees),~~ jointly submitted a NPDES Application No. CAS 618033, a Report of Waste Discharge (the ROWD) and a revised Drainage Area Management Plan (DAMP) to renew the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) NPDES permit for the Santa Ana River watershed (the Permit Area) within Riverside County. This Order renews the NPDES permit authorizing Urban Runoff in the Permit Area (see Appendix 1, "urban area" includes those portions of "agriculture" and "open space" that convert to industrial, commercial, or residential use during the term of this Order). To more effectively carry out the requirements of this Order, the Permittees have agreed that the RCFC&WCD will continue as the Principal Permittee and the County and the incorporated cities will continue as the Co-Permittees.

On February 5, 2008 Wildomar residents voted for cityhood and the City incorporated on July 1, 2008. Menifee residents voted for cityhood on June 3, 2008 and the City incorporated on October 1, 2008. On May 6, 2009, the City of Menifee and on May 5, 2009, the City of Wildomar have submitted Letter of Intent to be a Co-Permittee in this Order and for the purposes of this Order shall be considered as such. The cities in the Permit Area, along with the County, are

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009

collectively referred to as the Co-Permittees, and collectively, with the Principal Permittee, the Permittees.

## B. PROJECT AREA

The Permit Area contains 1,396 square miles or 19.1% of the 7,300 square miles within Riverside County and includes 15 of the 26 municipalities within Riverside County. The California Department of Finance estimates that as of January 1, 2006, the population of Riverside County is 1,953,330 of which 1,237,388<sup>1</sup> reside within the Permit Area. The California Department of Finance estimates that as of January 1, 2009, the population of Riverside County was 2,107,653<sup>2</sup>. Beaumont, Calimesa, and Canyon Lake have populations of 25,000 or less. The County, Corona, Moreno Valley and Riverside have populations of 100,000 or more. The Southern California Association of Governments estimates that the County of Riverside will grow by 16% between 2006 and 2010 (2008 RTP Growth Forecast by City). The most significant percentage growth in population between 2006 and 2010 is expected in the Cities of Beaumont, Calimesa, and San Jacinto.

Deleted: 8

Deleted: 2,088,322

Land uses in Riverside County within the Santa Ana River Region include open space, residential, commercial, light industrial, heavy industrial, and agriculture. The agricultural land uses include row crops, nurseries, citrus groves and vineyards, dairies, ranches, poultry and hog farms, and other agricultural related uses with one single-family residence allowed per 10 acres (County of Riverside General Plan, Land Use Element 2003). The conversion of agricultural lands and open space to other "developed" land uses has been ongoing and will continue. Based on Riverside County Assessor's Parcel Data as of February 2006, the land use mix of the County area within the Santa Ana Region was: 29,441 acres used or zoned for commercial/industrial purposes (3.3%), 70,499 acres for residential purposes (7.9%), 11,798 acres utilized for improved streets and roads, (1.3%), 9,872 acres are used for parks and recreational facilities (1.1%), 70,164 acres are used for rural residential (7.9%), 453,976 acres are vacant or utilized for open space (50.8%), and 48,627 acres are used for agricultural purposes (5.4%). The federal, state, tribal, and non-Permittee jurisdictional lands within the portion of Riverside County within the Santa Ana Region total government owns 199,064 acres (22.3%) of the territory within the area shown on Appendix 4.

Deleted: 4

Deleted: 140,663

Deleted: 16

Deleted: roadways

Deleted: 463,848

Deleted: 52

Less than one fifth (1/5) of the entire acreage within Riverside County drains into water bodies is within the Permit Area. The Permit Area includes the "urban area"

<sup>1</sup> As per Section 3.3.1 of the 2007 2006 ROWD, (Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG), excluding the cities of Menifee and Wildomar

<sup>2</sup> E-1 report dated April 30, 2009 ([http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/estimates/e-1/2008-09/documents/E-1\\_2009%20Press%20Release.pdf](http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/estimates/e-1/2008-09/documents/E-1_2009%20Press%20Release.pdf)).

Tentative Second Public Draft

October 22, 2009.

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

as shown in Appendix 1 and those portions of "agriculture" and "open space" as shown on Appendix 1 that do convert to industrial, commercial or residential use during the term of this Order. The Permit Area is delineated by the San Bernardino-Riverside County boundary line on the north and northwest, the Orange Riverside County boundary line on the west, the Santa Ana-San Diego Regional Board boundary line on the south, and the Santa Ana Colorado River Basin Regional Board boundary line on the east. Sixty-seven percent of Riverside County's population resides within the Regional Board's jurisdiction. The San Diego and the Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Boards regulate Urban Runoff from those portions of Riverside County outside of the Permit Area shown in Appendix 1.

### C. CLEAN WATER ACT REQUIREMENTS

The federal Clean Water Act (the "CWA") established a national policy designed to help maintain and restore the physical, chemical and biological integrity of the nation's waters. In 1972, the CWA established the NPDES permit program to regulate the discharge of ~~Pollutants~~ from point sources to ~~waters of the nation~~ ~~(the "waters~~ "Waters of the U. S.)". From 1972 to 1987, the main focus of the NPDES program was to regulate conventional ~~Pollutant~~ sources such as sewage treatment plants and industrial facilities. As a result, on a nationwide basis, non-point sources, including agricultural runoff and Urban Runoff, now contribute a larger portion of many kinds of ~~Pollutants~~ than the more thoroughly regulated sewage treatment plants and industrial facilities.

Deleted: p

Deleted: p

Deleted: p

The National Urban Runoff Program (NURP) final report to the Congress (USEPA, 1983) concluded that the goals of the CWA could not be achieved without addressing Urban Runoff discharges. The 1987 CWA amendments established a framework for regulating Urban Runoff. Pursuant to these amendments, the Santa Ana Regional Board began regulating ~~discharges from MS4s~~ municipal storm water runoff in 1990.

## II. REGULATORY BACKGROUND AND CLEAN WATER ACT REQUIREMENTS

As water flows over streets, parking lots, construction sites, and industrial, commercial, residential, and municipal areas, it can intercept ~~Pollutants~~ from these areas and transport them to Waters of the U.S. As indicated in I. A, above, Urban Runoff may contain pathogens, sediment, trash, fertilizers, oxygen-demanding substances, pesticides, heavy metals, and petroleum products. If not properly managed and controlled, urbanization may adversely impact water quality and quantity in the receiving waters.

Deleted: p

However, urban development projects that incorporate LID concepts could minimize the impact of urban development on runoff water quality and quantity.

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009

Studies<sup>3</sup> conducted in the Southern California area have established storm water runoff from urban areas as significant sources of ~~P~~ollutants in surface waters. The Santa Ana River is impacted by agricultural, other ~~r~~ discharges and Urban Runoff as it flows through the San Bernardino County and Riverside County areas prior to flowing through Orange County and into the Pacific Ocean. .

Deleted: p

If not properly controlled, Urban Runoff could be a significant source of ~~P~~ollutants in the Waters of the U. S. Table 1 includes a list of ~~P~~ollutants, ~~potential~~ ~~their~~ sources, and some of the adverse environmental consequences mostly resulting from urbanization.

Deleted: p

Deleted: p

<sup>3</sup> Bay, S., Jones, B. H. and Schiff, K, 1999, Study of the Impact of Stormwater Discharge on Santa Monica Bay. Sea Grant Program, University of Southern California; and Haile, R.W., et al., 1996, An Epidemiological Study of Possible Adverse Health Effects of Swimming in Santa Monica Bay. Southern California Coastal Water Research Project (1992), Surface Runoff to the Southern California Bight.

~~Tentative Second~~ Public Draft

~~October 22, 2009~~

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

**Table 1<sup>4</sup>**  
**Pollutant Sources and Impacts of a Number of Pollutants**  
**On Waters of the U.S.**

Pollutants	Sources	Effects and Trends
Toxins (e.g., biocides, PCBs, trace metals, heavy metals)	Industrial and municipal wastewater; runoff from farms, forests, urban areas, and landfills; erosion of contaminated soils and sediments; vessels; atmospheric deposition	Poison and cause disease and reproductive failure; fat-soluble toxins may bioconcentrate, particularly in birds and mammals, and pose human health risks. Inputs into Waters of the U.S. have declined, but remaining inputs and contaminated sediments in urban and industrial areas pose threats to living resources.
Pesticides (DDT, diazinon, chlorpyrifos)	Urban Runoff, agricultural runoff, commercial, industrial, residential and farm use	The use of legacy pesticides (DDT, chlordane, dieldrin) has been banned or restricted; still persists in the environment; some of the other pesticide uses are curtailed or restricted.
Biostimulants (organic wastes, plant nutrients)	Sewage and industrial wastes; runoff from farms and urban areas; nitrogen from combustion of fossil fuels	Organic wastes overload bottom habitats and deplete oxygen; nutrient inputs stimulate algal blooms (some harmful), which reduce water clarity, and alter food chains supporting fisheries. While organic waste loading has decreased, nutrient loading has increased (NRC, 1993a, 2000a).
Petroleum products (oil, grease, petroleum hydrocarbons, PAHs)	Urban Runoff and atmospheric deposition from land activities; accidental spills; oil & gas production activities; natural seepage; and PAHs from internal combustion engines	Petroleum hydrocarbons can affect bottom organisms and larvae; spills affect birds, mammals and aquatic life. While oil pollution from accidental spills and production activities has decreased, diffuse inputs from land-based activities have not (NRC, 1985).
Radioactive isotopes	Atmospheric fallout, industrial and military activities	Bioaccumulation may pose human health risks where contamination is heavy.
Sediments	Erosion from farming, construction activities, forestry, mining, development; river diversions; coastal dredging and mining	Reduce water clarity and change bottom habitats; carry toxins and nutrients; clog fish gills and interfere with respiration in aquatic fauna. Sediment delivery by many rivers has decreased, but sedimentation poses problems in some areas.
Plastics and other debris	Ships, boats, fishing nets, containers, trash, Urban Runoff	Entangles aquatic life or is ingested; degrades, beaches, lake shores, near shore habitats, and wetland habitats. Floatables (from trash) are an aesthetic nuisance and can be a substrate for algae and insect vectors.
Thermal	Cooling water from power plants and industry, urban runoff from impervious surfaces	Kills some temperature-sensitive species; and displaces others. Generally, less a risk to marine life than thought 20 years ago.
Noise	Vessel propulsion, sonar, seismic prospecting, low-frequency sound used in defense and research	May disturb marine mammals and other organisms that use sound for communication.
Pathogens (bacteria, protozoa, viruses)	Sewage, Urban Runoff, livestock, wildlife, and discharges from boats and cruise ships.	Pose health risks to swimmers and consumers of aquatic life. Sanitation has improved, but standards have been raised (NRC 1999a).
Alien species	Ships and ballast water, fishery stocking, aquarists	Displace native species, introduce new diseases; growing worldwide problem (NRC 1996).

Deleted: p

Deleted: n

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

<sup>4</sup> Adapted from "Marine Pollution in the United States" prepared for the Pew Oceans Commission, 2001.

Tentative Second Public Draft

October 22, 2009



The CWA prohibits the discharge of any ~~P~~ollutant to navigable waters from a ~~P~~oint ~~S~~ource unless an NPDES permit authorizes the discharge. Efforts to improve water quality under the NPDES program traditionally and primarily focused on reducing pollutants in discharges of industrial process wastewater and municipal sewage. The 1987 amendments to the CWA required MS4s and industrial facilities, including construction sites, to obtain NPDES permits for storm water runoff from their facilities. On November 16, 1990, the USEPA promulgated the final Phase I storm water regulations. The storm water regulations are contained in 40 CFR Parts 122, 123 and 124.

Deleted: p

Deleted: p

Deleted: s

On July 13, 1990, the Regional Board adopted the first term Riverside County Area-wide MS4 Permit, Order No. 90-104 (NPDES No. CA 8000192), for Urban Runoff from areas in Riverside County within the Permit Area. On March 8, 1996, the Regional Board renewed Order No. 90-104 by adopting the second term area-wide MS4 ~~P~~ermit, Order No. 96-30, (NPDES No. CAS618033). On October 25, 2002, the Regional Board renewed Order No. 96-30 by adopting the third term area-wide MS4 ~~P~~ermit, Order No. R8-2002-0011.

Deleted: p

Deleted: p

This Order renews the area-wide NPDES ~~MS4 Permit~~ permit for the Permit Area for the fourth-term, in accordance with Section 402 (p) of the CWA and all requirements applicable to an NPDES permit issued under the issuing authority's discretionary authority. The requirements included in this Order are consistent with the CWA, the federal regulations governing urban storm water discharges, the Water Quality Control Plan for the Santa Ana River Basin (Basin Plan), the California Water Code, and the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Board) Plans and Policies.

The Basin Plan is the basis for the Regional Board's regulatory programs. The Basin Plan was developed and is periodically reviewed and updated in accordance with relevant federal and state law and regulation, including the CWA and the California Water Code. As required, the Basin Plan designates the Beneficial Uses of the waters of the Region and specifies ~~Water Quality Objectives~~ ~~water quality objectives~~ intended to protect those uses. (Beneficial Uses and ~~Water Quality Objectives~~ ~~water quality objectives~~, together with an anti-degradation policy, comprise federal "~~Water Quality Standard~~ ~~water quality standards~~"). The Basin Plan also specifies an implementation plan, which includes certain discharge prohibitions. In general, the Basin Plan makes no distinctions between wet and dry weather conditions in designating Beneficial Uses and setting water quality objectives, i.e., the Beneficial Uses, and correspondingly, the ~~Water Quality Objectives~~ ~~water quality objectives~~ are assumed to apply year-round. (Note: In some cases, beneficial uses for certain surface waters are designated as "I", or intermittent, in recognition of the fact that surface flows (and Beneficial Uses) may be present only during wet weather.) Most Beneficial Uses and water quality objectives were established in the 1971, 1975, 1983, and 1995 Basin Plans. The 1995 Basin Plan was updated in February 2008<sup>5</sup>. Amendments to the Basin Plan

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

<sup>5</sup> [http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana/water\\_issues/programs/basin\\_plan/index.shtml](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana/water_issues/programs/basin_plan/index.shtml)

included new nitrate-nitrogen and TDS objectives for specified management zones, new nitrogen and TDS management strategies applicable to both surface and ground waters and various Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) and TMDL Implementation Plans that had been adopted for Impaired Waterbodies ~~impaired water bodies~~ within the region.

Water Code Section 13241 requires that certain factors must be considered, ~~at a minimum~~, when Water Quality Objectives ~~water quality objectives~~ are established. These factors include economics and the need for developing housing in the Region. During the 2002 MS4 Permit ~~third term permit~~ development process, the Permittees raised an issue regarding compliance with Section 13241 of the California Water Code with respect to Water Quality Objectives ~~water quality objectives~~ for wet weather conditions, specifically the cost of achieving compliance during wet weather conditions and the need for developing housing within the Region and its impact on Urban Runoff. During the 2006 review of the Basin Plan, this matter was incorporated on the triennial review list. To begin addressing this issue, Regional Board staff, in collaboration with the MS4 Permittees in the Santa Ana River watershed, has organized a Storm Water Quality Standards Task Force (SWQSTF).

The SWQSTF is closely analyzing, monitoring and documenting actual and potential Beneficial Uses of surface waters within the Santa Ana River watershed. Based on the findings, the SWQSTF plans to recommend changes to the current Beneficial Use designations and Water Quality Objectives ~~water quality objectives~~ specified in the Basin Plan. This Order may be reopened to incorporate any changes to the Water Quality Standards ~~water quality standards~~. The SWQSTF is currently focusing on Recreational Beneficial Uses. In the meantime, the provisions of this Order will result in reasonable further progress towards the attainment of the existing Water Quality Objectives ~~water quality objectives~~, in accordance with the discretion in the permitting authority recognized by the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in *Defenders of Wildlife vs. Browner*, 191 F.3d 1159, 1164 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1999).

### III. EXCLUSIONS TO THE PERMIT AREA

Areas of the County not addressed or which are excluded by the storm water regulations and areas not under the jurisdiction of the Permittees ~~were~~ are excluded from the area requested for coverage under the ROWD ~~this permit application~~. These include the following areas and activities:

- Federal lands and State properties, including, but not limited to, military bases, national forests, hospitals, colleges and universities, and highways;
- Native American tribal lands;

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009



- Open space and rural (non-urbanized) areas;
- Agricultural lands ([return flows from irrigated agriculture and nonpoint source agricultural activities are](#) exempted under the CWA); and
- Utilities, railroads, and special districts (including school districts, park districts, publicly owned treatment works and water utilities, etc.).

These areas in the Permit Area for which coverage under a NPDES MS4 permit is excluded, are shown in Appendix 1. [The Regional Board will coordinate with these entities to implement programs that are consistent with the requirements of this Order. The Regional Board, pursuant to 40 CFR 122.26\(a\), has the discretion and authority to require non-cooperating entities to participate in this Order. The Regional Board may also consider such facilities for coverage under its NPDES permitting scheme pursuant to USEPA Phase II storm water regulations.](#)

[The Regional Board recognizes that the Permittees should not be held responsible for discharges from such facilities or Pollutants in those discharges. However, to the extent that the Permittees authorize the connection of the discharges from these facilities into their MS4, this Order requires the Permittees to notify these facilities, in writing, of the state and local post-construction standards and/or other applicable requirements of this Order.](#)

#### IV. **BENEFICIAL USES**

~~Stormwater~~ ~~Storm water~~ flows discharged to MS4s in the Permit Area are tributary to various ~~waterbodies~~ ~~water bodies~~ (inland surface streams, lakes and reservoirs) of the State. The Beneficial Uses of these ~~waterbodies~~ ~~water bodies~~ may include municipal and domestic supply, agricultural supply, industrial service and process supply, groundwater recharge, water contact recreation, non-contact water recreation, and sport fishing, warm freshwater habitat, cold freshwater habitat, preservation of biological habitats of special significance, wildlife habitat and preservation of rare, threatened or endangered species. The ultimate goal of this Order is to protect the Beneficial Uses and quality of the Receiving Waters.

To protect the Beneficial Uses of the Receiving Waters, the ~~P~~ollutants from all sources, including Urban Runoff, need to be controlled. Recognizing this, and the fact that Urban Runoff contains ~~P~~ollutants, an area-wide MS4 permit is the most effective way to develop and implement a comprehensive Urban Runoff management program in a timely manner. This area-wide MS4 permit contains requirements with time schedules that will allow the Permittees to continue to address water quality problems caused by Urban Runoff through their management programs to reduce ~~P~~ollutants in Urban Runoff discharges consistent with the MEP standard [See Appendix 4, Glossary].

~~Tentative Second~~ Public Draft  
~~October 22, 2009~~

Deleted: p

Deleted: p

Deleted: p

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

## **V. WATERSHED MANAGEMENT IN THE UPPER SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN**

### **A. Management Approach**

To regulate and control Urban Runoff from the Permit Area to the MS4s, an area-wide approach is ~~essential and a holistic approach is needed to efficiently manage the water quality of the Region expected to be most effective~~. The entire MS4 is not controlled by a single entity; the RCFC&WCD, the County, several cities, the State Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, in addition to other smaller entities, manage ~~portions of~~ the MS4s. In addition to the cities, the County and the RCFC&WCD, there are a number of other significant contributors of Urban Runoff to these MS4s. These include: large institutions such as the State university system, prisons, schools, hospitals, etc.; federal facilities such as military sites, etc.; State agencies, such as Caltrans; water and wastewater management agencies such as Eastern and Western Municipal Water District; the National Forest Service and State parks. The State Board has issued a separate NPDES permit to Caltrans. In addition, Caltrans, and the other contributors identified, are not under the jurisdiction of the Permittees. The management and control of the entire MS4 cannot be effectively carried out without the cooperation and efforts of all these entities. Also, it would not be ~~effective meaningful~~ to issue a separate MS4 permit to each of the entities within the Permit Area whose land/facilities drain into the MS4s operated by the Permittees and ultimately to Waters of the U.S. The Regional Board has concluded that the best management option for the Permit Area is to issue an area-wide NPDES MS4 permit to the Permittees.

Although, the Urban Runoff from the Permit Area drains ~~to the Prado Basin, and ultimately~~ into Orange County, Urban Runoff from Orange County areas are regulated under NPDES No. CAS 618030. Some areas within Riverside County are within the Colorado River Basin and San Diego Regional Boards' jurisdictions. Permit requirements for Urban Runoff from the drainage areas of Riverside County within the jurisdiction of the San Diego and Colorado River Basin Regional Boards are addressed by those Regional Boards.

In developing Urban Runoff management and monitoring programs, consultation/coordination with other drainage management entities and other Regional Boards is essential. Common programs, reports, implementation schedules and efforts are desirable and will be utilized to the MEP.

Cooperation and coordination among all the stakeholders are essential for efficient and economical management of the ~~Santa Ana River~~ watershed. It is also critical to manage non-point sources at a level consistent with the management of Urban Runoff in a watershed in order to successfully prevent or remedy water quality

~~Tentative Second~~ Public Draft  
~~October 22, 2009~~

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

~~Impairment.~~ Regional Board staff will facilitate coordination of monitoring and management programs among the various stakeholders.

Deleted: i

An integrated watershed management approach for Urban Runoff is consistent with the Strategic Plan (2008-2012<sup>6</sup>) and Initiatives for the State and Regional Boards and the draft California Water Plan Update<sup>7</sup>. A watershed wide approach is also necessary for implementation of the load and WLAs developed under the TMDL process. The Permittees and all the affected entities are encouraged to participate in regional or watershed solutions, instead of project-specific and fragmented solutions.

The ~~P~~ollutants in Urban Runoff originate from ~~multiple a multitude of~~ sources and effective control of these ~~P~~ollutants requires a cooperative effort of all the stakeholders and many regulatory agencies. Every stage of urbanization should be considered in developing appropriate Urban Runoff ~~P~~ollution control methodologies. The program's success depends upon consideration of ~~P~~ollution control techniques during planning, construction and post-construction operations. At each stage, appropriate ~~P~~ollution ~~P~~revention measures, proper site design considerations, ~~source control measures~~ Source Control Measures, and, if necessary, ~~treatment techniques~~ Treatment Control BMPs should be considered.

Deleted: p

Deleted: p

Deleted: p

Deleted: p

Deleted: p

Deleted: p

## **B. SUB-WATERSHEDS AND MAJOR CHALLENGES**

The Santa Ana River watershed is the major watershed within the Santa Ana Region. This watershed is divided into three sub-watersheds: the Lower Santa Ana, Upper Santa Ana, and San Jacinto.

1. The lower Santa Ana River sub-watershed (downstream from Prado Basin) includes the north half of Orange County. The Upper Santa Ana River sub-watershed includes the southwestern corner of San Bernardino County and the northwestern corner of Riverside County. The San Jacinto sub-watershed includes the northwest corner of Riverside County south of the Upper Santa Ana River sub-watershed within the Santa Ana Region.

Generally, the San Bernardino County drainage areas drain to the Riverside County drainage areas, and Riverside County drainage areas discharge to Orange County through Prado Dam on the Santa Ana River. Most of the flow in the Santa Ana River is recharged into the ~~ground-water~~ groundwater in Orange County but infrequently some of the flow may be discharged to the Pacific Ocean as a result of heavy storm events.

Water from rainfall and snow melt runoff, and surfacing ground water from various areas either discharge directly to the Santa Ana River or to

<sup>6</sup> State Water Resources Control Board, Strategic Plan Update, 2008-2012, September 2, 2008

<sup>7</sup> [http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/docs/cwpu2009/1208prd/vol2/UrbanRunoff\\_PRD\\_09.pdf](http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/docs/cwpu2009/1208prd/vol2/UrbanRunoff_PRD_09.pdf)

Tentative Second Public Draft

October 22, 2009

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

watercourses tributary to the Santa Ana River. Other major rivers in the Permit Area include the San Jacinto River and Temescal Creek. The San Jacinto Mountain areas drain into the San Jacinto River, which discharges into Canyon Lake and then to Lake Elsinore. The San Jacinto River is ephemeral. Smaller storms tend to be fully captured by Canyon Lake, which the San Jacinto River drains into, with discharges from Canyon Lake to Lake Elsinore only occurring in larger events or wetter years. Any overflow from Lake Elsinore is tributary to Temescal Creek, which flows into the Santa Ana River at the Prado Flood Control Basin. Overflow from Lake Elsinore occurs infrequently, only once every 12 to 15 years.

2. Upper Santa Ana River Sub-watershed:

a. Reach 3 of the Santa Ana River (Prado Dam to Mission Boulevard in Riverside): The Pollutant of Concern for Reach 3 based on adopted TMDLs and the 2006 303(d) list is pathogens. With the adoption of the TMDL for bacterial indicators, the Basin Plan now contains schedules for achieving compliance with waste load allocations (WLAs) for bacterial indicators in the Middle Santa Ana River (MSAR) subwatershed ~~watershed~~.

b. Reach 4 of the Santa Ana River: Reach 4 of the Santa Ana River is the portion of the River from Mission Boulevard Bridge in Riverside to the San Jacinto fault (Bunker Hill Dike) in San Bernardino. Reach 4 is also listed in the CWA Section 303(d) as an Impaired Waterbody. Most of Reach 4 of the River is in San Bernardino County. The Pollutant of Concern for Reach 4 is pathogens, scheduled for TMDL completion in 2019.

c. Other water quality problems along this reach of the River include the buildup of total dissolved solids (TDS, dissolved salts or minerals) and nitrogen, largely in nitrate form. The buildup of TDS and nitrates can impact downstream beneficial uses, including groundwater recharge. The buildup of TDS and nitrate is mostly due to agricultural uses, including dairies and the application of fertilizers, municipal and industrial wastewater discharges, and reuse and recycling operations. A complex set of programs and policies are included in the Basin Plan to address this problem, including a water supply plan, a wastewater management plan, and a groundwater management plan. Other elements of the Basin Plan include the non-point source program and the storm water program. The Basin Plan identifies the Statewide General Permits and the MS4 permits as the regulatory tools for storm water management in the Basin. In light of the recently adopted Nitrogen-TDS objectives for certain management zones, this Order requires the Permittees to determine baseline concentration of these constituents in dry weather runoff, if any, from significant outfall locations. The Order also includes effluent limitations for TDS and nitrates under dry weather conditions.

Deleted:

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009

d. San Jacinto Sub-watershed: Canyon Lake and Lake Elsinore are in this watershed and are listed on the 2006 303(d) list for pathogens (Canyon Lake) and PCBs and unknown toxicity (Lake Elsinore). Nutrient TMDLs have been developed for both Canyon Lake and Lake Elsinore. The Basin Plan contains schedules for achieving compliance with WLAs for nutrients in the San Jacinto sub-watershed (Canyon Lake/Lake Elsinore).

Deleted: f  
f

### C. CWA SECTION 303(d) LIST AND TMDLS:

Pursuant to Section 303(b) of the CWA, the 2006 water quality assessment conducted by the Regional Board listed a number of ~~water bodies~~ waterbodies within the Region under Section 303(d) of the CWA as Impaired Waterbodies. These are ~~water bodies~~ waterbodies where Water Quality Objectives are being violated and it is presumed that the designated Beneficial Uses are not met ~~and the water quality objectives are being violated~~. The sources of the Impairments include POTW discharges, and runoff from agricultural, open space and urban land uses. The Impaired Waterbodies in Riverside County within the Santa Ana Regional Board's jurisdiction are listed in Table 2. In addition, CWA Section 303(d) requires states to develop and submit to USEPA for approval a list of waterbodies that are not meeting ~~water quality standards (WQS)~~ Water Quality Standards (Water Quality Objectives and Beneficial Uses) and are not expected to attain these standards even with technology based controls. CWA Section 305(b) requires States to biennially prepare and submit to the USEPA for approval a report assessing statewide surface water quality.

Deleted: i

Deleted: s

~~Staff of the Santa Ana~~ Regional Board ~~staff have~~ has reviewed and reevaluated all water quality monitoring and information, combined the CWA Section 305(b) Report with the Section 303(d) List of Impaired Waters and introduced the Proposed 2008 303(d)-305(b) Integrated Report, that was adopted by the Regional Board on April 24, 2009, by the Regional Board. The additional ~~impaired waters~~ Impaired Waterbodies that are on this list are also ~~included~~ identified in Table 2. The Proposed 2008 303(d)-305(b) Integrated Report will not be effective until it has ~~not~~ been approved by the State Board or the USEPA.

Federal regulations require that a TMDL be established for each 303(d) listed waterbody for each of the ~~P~~ Pollutants causing ~~mpairment~~. The TMDL is the total amount of the ~~problem pollutant~~ Pollutant that can be discharged without impairing Water Quality Standards while water quality standards in the receiving water are attained Receiving Water, i.e., Water Quality Objectives ~~water quality objectives~~ are met and the Beneficial Uses are protected. It is the sum of the individual WLAs for point source inputs, and LAs for non-point source inputs and natural background, with a margin of safety. The TMDLs are the basis for limitations established in Waste Discharge Requirements. TMDLs are being developed for all ~~P~~ Pollutants identified in Table 2. The Permittees are required to ~~shall~~ revise their DAMP, at the direction of the Executive Officer, to incorporate

Deleted: p

Deleted: i

Deleted: p

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009



TMDL ~~Program Implementation Plans~~ ~~program implementation plans~~ developed and approved pursuant to the process for the designation and implementation of TMDLs for Impaired Waterbodies.

For 303(d) listed waterbodies ~~identified as potentially impaired by Urban Runoff and~~ without a TMDL, the Permittees are required to provide special protections ~~such as requiring effective post-construction BMPs, enhanced training programs and developing targeted public outreach through development and implementation of focused control measures~~ that would address the Pollutants of Concern. ~~If~~

This Order incorporates TMDLs that have been adopted for bacterial indicator in the Middle Santa Ana River Watershed and for nutrients in the Lake Elsinore and Canyon Lake Watersheds. On August 26, 2005, the Regional Board adopted Resolution No. R8-2005-001 amending the Basin Plan to incorporate Bacterial Indicator TMDL for Middle Santa Ana River Watershed. On December 20, 2004, the Regional Board adopted resolution R8-2004-0037 amending the Basin Plan to incorporate the Lake Elsinore and Canyon Lake nutrient TMDLs. The stakeholders in these watersheds, including applicable Permittees, are collaborating in the development and implementation of the TMDLs.

This Order includes permit conditions necessary to implement the TMDLs already approved by the Regional Board as required by federal regulations at 40 CFR 122.44(d)(vii)(B). This Order incorporates the WLAs as Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBEL) and requires Permittees to achieve the WLA for Urban Runoff through an iterative process of implementing BMPs consistent with the MEP standard. Failure to submit a BMP implementation plan to the Regional Board or failure to implement the approved plan in a timely manner will be deemed to violate the conditions of this Order. The CWA requires the Permittees to have appropriate controls to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the MEP, including management practices, control techniques and systems, design and engineering methods, and such other provisions as the Administrator or the State determines appropriate for the control of such pollutants (33 USC 1342(p)(3)(B)). MEP is a dynamic performance standard and it evolves as the knowledge of urban runoff control measures increases. Permittees are required to monitor and report effectiveness of their BMPs with respect to pollutant reduction goal(s) as one measure of progress toward reducing pollutant loads from urban sources in accordance with the compliance schedules specified in the TMDL implementation plans. If on-going monitoring indicates that implemented BMPs are insufficient to assure compliance with the relevant water quality standard(s), ~~then is yet to be developed~~, the Permittees are required to develop ~~and implement constituent specific source control measures, conduct monitoring and/or cooperate with the development of an implementation more effective BMPs~~ for the controllable urban sources within their jurisdiction to the MEP. In addition, the Permittees are required to submit a revised BMP implementation

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009

Deleted:

Deleted: ¶

**Deleted:** Where a TMDL has been ~~developed and an~~ approved, NPDES permits must contain effluent limits and conditions consistent with the requirements and assumptions of the wasteload allocations in the TMDL. See 40 CFR § 122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B). Effluent limitations to control the discharge of pollutants generally are expressed in numerical form. However, in light of 33 U.S.C. §1342(p)(3)(B)(iii), EPA recommends that for NPDES-regulated municipal and small construction storm water discharges effluent limits should be expressed as best management practices (BMPs) or other similar requirements, rather than as numeric effluent limits. See Interim Permitting Approach for Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations in Storm Water Permits, 61 FR 43761 (Aug. 26, 1996). The Interim Permitting Approach Policy recognizes the need for an iterative approach to control pollutants in storm water discharges. Specifically, the policy anticipates that a suite of BMPs will be used in the initial rounds of permits and that these BMPs will be tailored in subsequent rounds. ¶

EPA's policy recognizes that because storm water discharges are due to storm events that are highly variable in frequency and duration and are not easily characterized, only in rare cases will it be feasible or appropriate to establish numeric limits for municipal and small construction storm water discharges. The variability in the system and minimal data generally available make it difficult to determine with precision or certainty actual and projected loadings for individual dischargers or groups of dischargers. Therefore, EPA believes that in these situations, permit limits typically can be expressed as BMPs, and that numeric limits will be used only in rare instances. ¶

Deleted: additional

Deleted: plan

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009



plan documenting the completion schedule for any additional and/or more effective BMPs and must execute the plan upon approval by the Executive Officer. Taken together, these permit conditions are consistent with the facts and assumptions specified in the TMDLs, including the TMDL Implementation Plans, and are expected to achieve compliance with the related WLAs.

The WLAs are included as numeric effluent limits. Numeric effluent limits are also included for de-minimus types of discharges from Permittee-owned or permittee-operated facilities and activities and for total dissolved solids and total inorganic nitrogen for dry weather discharges.

TENTATIVE

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009

**Table 2**

**2006 CWA Section 303(d) Listed Waterbodies and  
 April 24, 2009 Proposed 2008 Integrated Report of 305(b) and  
 303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Segments**

<b>WATERBODY</b>	<b>HYDRO UNIT</b>	<b>POLLUTANT/ STRESSOR</b>	<b>SOURCE</b>	<b>SIZE AFFECTED</b>
Canyon Lake	802.120	Pathogens	Nonpoint Source	453 Acres
Lake Elsinore	802.310	Unknown Toxicity	Unknown Nonpoint Source	2431 Acres
		PCB's.	Unknown Nonpoint Source	2431 Acres
		Proposed for 2008 Sediment Toxicity	Unknown Point and/or Nonpoint Sources	2431 Acres
Lake Fulmor	802.210	Pathogens	Unknown Nonpoint Source	4.2 Acres
Santa Ana River, Reach 3	801.200	Pathogens	Unknown Nonpoint Source	3 miles
		Proposed for 2008 Copper – Wet Season	Unknown Nonpoint Source	3 Miles
Temescal Creek Reach 1		Proposed for 2008 pH	Unknown	Unknown

Deleted:

**VI. FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD TERM PERMITS**

**A. STORM WATER POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAMS AND POLICIES**

1. Prior to USEPA's promulgation of the final regulations implementing the storm water requirements of the 1987 CWA amendments, the counties of Orange, Riverside and San Bernardino requested an area-wide NPDES permit for storm water runoff for each of the county areas within the [Santa Ana](#) Regional Board's jurisdiction. On July 13, 1990, the Regional Board issued Order No. 90-104 to the Permittees (first term [MS4 Permit](#)). In 1996, the Regional Board adopted Order No. 96-30 for the Riverside County Permit Area (second

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

[Tentative Second](#) Public Draft  
[October 22, 2009](#)

term permit). On October 24, 2002, the Regional Board adopted Order No. R8-2002-0011 for the Riverside County Permit Area (third term ~~MS4 Permit~~ permit). These ~~MS4 Permits~~ permits included the following requirements:

- a. Prohibited non-storm water discharges to the MS4s with certain exceptions.
- b. Required the Permittees to develop and implement a DAMP to reduce ~~P~~ pollutants in Urban Runoff to the MEP.
- c. Required the discharges from the MS4 to meet ~~water quality standards~~ ~~Water Quality Standards~~ in Receiving Waters.
- d. Required the Permittees to identify and eliminate ~~illicit connections and illegal discharges IC/IDs~~ to the MS4.
- e. Required the Permittees to establish legal authority to enforce Storm Water Ordinances.
- f. Required monitoring of dry weather flows, storm flows, and Receiving Water quality, and program assessment.
- g. Required the Permittees to inventory, prioritize and inspect construction sites and industrial and commercial facilities based on threat to water quality.
- h. Required the Permittees to develop a restaurant inspection program to address practices that may impact Urban Runoff quality such as oil and grease disposal, trash bin area management, parking lot cleaning, spill clean-up, and inspection of grease traps or interceptors to ensure adequate capacity and proper maintenance.
- i. Required the Permittees to review and approve Water Quality Management Plans (WQMPs) for categories of New Development and Significant Redevelopment projects to address post-development ~~runoff~~ ~~Urban Runoff~~ water quality and ~~H~~ hydromodification.
- j. Required the Permittees to develop a unified response plan to respond to sewage spills that may impact Receiving Water quality.

Deleted: p

Deleted: h

During the first term ~~MS4 Permit~~ permit, the Permittees developed a DAMP that was approved by the Executive Officer on January 18, 1994. The DAMP included five BMP groups: environmental education activities, solid waste activities, road drainage system operations and maintenance, regulatory and enforcement activities, and structural controls. The DAMP was updated as part of the second and third-term ~~MS4~~ Permits. The Permittees submitted a revised DAMP with the ~~ROWD for the~~ fourth term ~~MS4 Permit~~ permit renewal ~~application (ROWD)~~.

2. The RCFC&WCD performs water quality monitoring activities in support of three separate area-wide NPDES MS4 Permits (Santa Ana, San Diego and Colorado River Basin) under the Consolidated Monitoring ~~Program~~ (CMP). ~~The CMP contains a combined 132 historical, active, and special project sampling~~

Deleted: Program for Water Quality

Deleted:

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

~~Tentative Second~~ Public Draft  
~~October 22, 2009~~

locations in the three MS4 Permit regions. Within the Permit Area, water column  
Water-samples and/or sediment samples have been collected at a total of 7493  
locations over the last fifteen-nineteen years. These 74-93 locations are  
comprised of 45 MS4 storm drain outfalls, 12-43 Receiving Water, 8 receiving  
water, 15 sediment, and 2 special interest sampling locations. In addition, the  
Permittees participate in a number of sub-regional and regional monitoring  
programs and special studies.

3. During the third term MS4 Permit, the Executive Officer approved the delay in  
implementing the bioassessment requirement to allow the development of  
indices of biological integrity applicable to inland waters. Subsequently, a  
regional bioassessment monitoring was initiated by the Surface Water  
Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP) to determine the conditions of the  
receiving waters in a more holistic way. The Southern California Watershed  
Research Project (SCCWRP), in conjunction with the southern California MS4  
Permit programs, has developed a regional bioassessment monitoring  
program in which the Permittees participating. This Order requires the  
Permittees to continue to participate in the regional bioassessment monitoring  
program. It is expected that these monitoring stations and Permittee and  
regional monitoring will be used to identify problem areas and to re-evaluate the  
monitoring program and the effectiveness of BMPs. The future direction of  
some of these program elements will depend upon the results of the ongoing  
studies and a holistic approach to watershed management.

Deleted: p

4. Other elements of the Urban Runoff management program included  
identification and elimination of illegal discharges, illicit connections, IC/IDs and  
establishment of adequate legal authority to control Pollutants in Urban Runoff  
discharges. The Permittees have completed a survey of their MS4 to identify  
illegal/illicit connections IC/IDs and have adopted appropriate ordinances to  
establish legal authority. Some of the more specific achievements during the  
second and third term MS4 Permits are as follows:

Deleted: p

Deleted: p

- a. During the second term MS4 Permit, the Permittees operated under an  
Implementation Agreement that sets forth the responsibilities of the  
Permittees as defined in the 1996 MS4 Permit. The Permittees update this  
agreement during each MS4 Permit term. The Permittees have adopted  
Storm Water Ordinances regarding the management of Urban Runoff. The  
Storm Water Ordinances provide the Permittees with the legal authority to  
implement the requirements of the MS4 Permit and the key regulatory  
requirements contained in 40 CFR Section 122.26(d)(2)(I)(A-F).
- b. Revised DAMP: Includes 28 Construction Site and 36 Municipal and  
Industrial Source Control BMPs that are to be implemented by the  
Permittees for purposes of controlling Pollutants associated with Urban  
Runoff to the MEP. The Permittees also strengthened enforcement and  
compliance elements of the DAMP. Enhanced the construction site

Deleted: p

Deleted: p

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009

- inspections, the industrial/commercial facilities inspections, ~~new development~~ New Development review requirements, and the Permittee facilities and activities program.
- c. Cooperated in the establishment of TMDL Task Forces and workgroups for Lake Elsinore, Canyon Lake and the ~~Middle Santa Ana River~~ MSAR.
  - d. Assisted in development and implementation of the TMDLs for Canyon Lake, Lake Elsinore and the ~~Middle Santa Ana River~~ MSAR.
  - e. Developed and updated methods to track program effectiveness such as resident surveys, tracking hotline inquiries, and web counters.
  - f. In August 1999 the RCFC&WCD and the County's Environmental Health Department executed an agreement that provides the framework for an area-wide Commercial and Industrial Compliance Assistance Program (CAP).
  - g. The Permittees have participated in the CMP.
  - h. The Permittees administered area-wide programs including: hazardous materials emergency response, household hazardous waste collection, industrial/commercial ~~compliance assistance program~~ CAP and public education and outreach. Some of these programs were coordinated with Caltrans and local agencies.
  - i. A Municipal Facilities Strategy was established then later incorporated into the DAMP, the Supplement "A" New Development Guidelines were amended to require compliance with the Riverside County WQMP for specific categories of New Development and Significant Redevelopment projects.
  - j. The Riverside County WQMP was developed in 2004. The Model WQMP is a post-construction planning tool to address Urban Runoff from New Development and Significant Redevelopment. The WQMP is implemented on a watershed-specific level, and provides guidance for project specific post-construction BMPs to address the quantity and quality of Urban Runoff from ~~new development and significant redevelopment~~ New Development and Significant Redevelopment projects. Any New Development or Significant Redevelopment project that requires discretionary approval must submit a project-specific WQMP to the appropriate Permittee. The project-specific WQMP ensures that management of Urban Runoff to protect Receiving Water quality is considered a priority during project design and operation.
  - k. Established the Management Steering Committee that brings together the city managers in the Permit Area promoting consensus and communication on a regional basis.
  - l. Formation of sub-committees to guide and develop specific program elements (Construction Activities, Industrial/Commercial Activities, New Development/ Significant Redevelopment, Public Education, Permittee Facilities & Activities, Monitoring, & Finance).
  - m. Evaluated and revised ordinances, regulations, rules, and codes to ensure appropriate level of legal authority.

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

- n. A Technical Advisory Committee for overall program development and implementation was established.
- o. Program Review: A number of existing programs were reviewed to determine their effectiveness in combating Urban Runoff ~~P~~ollution and to recommend alternatives and or improvements, including ~~public agency~~ ~~Permittee~~ activities and facilities, ~~illegal discharges and illicit connections~~ ~~IC/IDs~~ to the MS4 systems, and existing monitoring programs.
- p. Enhanced Public Education program through development of new outreach materials and programs.
- q. Public Education: A number of steps were taken to educate the public, businesses, industries, and commercial establishments regarding their role in Urban Runoff ~~P~~ollution controls. The industrial dischargers were notified of the Urban Runoff regulatory requirements. For a number of unregulated activities, BMP guidance documents were developed and a toll free hotline was established for reporting any suspected water quality problems.
- r. The Storm Water Protection website was developed and is continually enhanced. It contains resources for residential facilities, businesses, developers and contractors. The website is accessible from the RCFC&WCD home page. The ~~Storm Water Protection~~ website offers free brochures that all web site visitors can print in quantities or can order including:
  - i. ~~After the Storm~~ – a citizen’s guide to understanding MS4 ~~P~~ollution in your neighborhood or when performing daily activities.
  - ii. ~~Automotive Maintenance & Car Care~~ – guidelines for keeping your auto shop or retail fuel facility in environmental shape.
  - iii. ~~Outdoor Cleaning Activities~~ – guideline for outdoor cleaning activities and wastewater disposal.
  - iv. ~~Pools, Spas and Fountains~~ –Environmental maintenance suggestions for pool, spa, and fountain owners.
  - v. ~~What’s the Scoop~~ – tips for a healthy pet and a healthier environment.
  - vi. ~~Household Hazardous Waste (HHW)~~ – A schedule of collection locations for proper disposal of HHW.
  - vii. ~~Storm Water Pollution Found in Your Neighborhood~~ – door hanger.
- s. In addition to the information provided on the ~~Only Rain Down the Storm Water Protection Drain~~ website, the Public Education and Outreach Program has:
  - i. Tested and/or implemented several new Public Education and Outreach Program effectiveness tracking mechanisms including call tracking, web counters, testing, and surveys.
  - ii. Conducted a review of the efficacy of Permittee employee training programs.
  - iii. Enhanced the toll free storm water ~~P~~ollution reporting hot line to include public education information and support for the Public and other interested stakeholders.

Deleted: p

Deleted: p

Deleted: p

Deleted: p

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

~~Tentative Second~~ Public Draft  
~~October 22, 2009~~



- iv. Enhanced on-line registration access for NPDES training to help facilitate training of appropriate Permittee employees.
  - v. Worked with the Riverside-Corona Resource Conservation District to develop home garden workshops and presentations to elementary and middle schools and staff to raise public awareness of Urban Runoff management issues and ~~source control methods~~ Source Control BMPs and to encourage volunteers, partners, and groups to gather annually for a trash and debris clean-up day along the Santa Ana River.
  - vi. Developed special newspaper and billing inserts, fliers and advertisements to raise public awareness of Urban Runoff management issues and ~~source control methods~~ Source Control BMPs. A radio advertising campaign was also developed and implemented for a limited time.
  - vii. Developed and presented workshops regarding household hazardous waste use and proper disposal at major home improvement stores through out Riverside County.
  - viii. Placed numerous advertisements in the Penny Saver and Bargain Bulletin to raise public awareness of Urban Runoff management.
  - ix. In cooperation with certain County Service Areas and other programs, pet waste signs with bag dispensers have been installed at various parks to help encourage the proper disposal of animal waste.
  - x. Coordinated with County-wide Animal Control Facilities, as well as city-owned animal control facilities and Humane Societies, to distribute specific materials to the County Agricultural inspectors as well as Regional Board inspectors for use during facility inspections.
  - xi. Distributed educational and outreach materials to the County Agricultural inspectors as well as Santa Ana Regional Board staff inspectors for use during facility inspections.
  - xii. Cooperated with the Western Riverside Council of Government (WRCOG) in the Used Oil Block Cycle Grant that decreases the amount of illegally dumped motor oil by promoting the addition of new Certified Oil Collection Centers.
  - xiii. Participated in WRCOG's "Cleanest County in the West" program to address issues relating to litter and illegal dumping which targeted both students and adults.
  - xiv. Supplemental Environmental Projects: As a result of an environmental enforcement case settlement brought by the County Department of Environmental Health, Conoco Phillips and Downs Energy developed two posters and a billboard, respectively. These items were designed to increase the awareness of appropriate BMPs for retail fuel businesses.
- t. Permittee Training: Training was provided to Permittee employees to implement New Development Guidelines and Public Works BMPs. The

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

fourth-term ~~MS4 P~~ermit specifies additional training requirements to focus on necessary competencies for storm water program managers, Permittee planners and inspection staff. This was added following information collected during Regional Board staff audits of Permittees' storm water management programs, which found that a number of the Permittees' staff and/or contractors were not adequately trained to properly implement the required program elements contained within the third term ~~MS4 P~~ermit and/or training programs were not properly documented.

Deleted: p

- u. Related Activities: Modified MS4s by channel stabilization and creation of sediment basins; eliminated or permitted and documented ~~Illicit~~ connections to the MS4s.
- v. Pursued and received Proposition 50 Planning Grant to develop an Integrated Regional Watershed Management Plan for the San Jacinto watershed and to facilitate implementation of the Canyon Lake/Lake Elsinore Nutrient TMDL.
- w. Pursued and received two Proposition 40 Integrated Regional Watershed Management Plan implementation grants to facilitate the ~~MSAR~~~~Middle Santa Ana River~~ ~~Pathogen~~ TMDL and Lake Elsinore and Canyon Lake Nutrient TMDLs.
- x. Co-Permittees developed and maintain an inventory database (or databases) of construction sites 1-acre or larger for which they have issued a building or grading permit. For each construction site/project included in a Co-Permittee's inventory, the Co-Permittees have assigned a priority of "high," "medium," or "low" to reflect the construction site's potential for impairing ~~Receiving Water~~ ~~receiving water~~ quality.
- y. Created databases for the commercial and industrial facilities within each jurisdiction.
- z. Developed a GIS Web Browser to assist developers and Permittees in identifying pertinent water quality information for proposed development projects.
- aa. Developed Planning Application forms for Permittee use to ensure that the need for a project-specific WQMP was properly identified early in the planning process.
- bb. Developed a FAQ and watershed ~~Impairment~~ maps to assist Permittees and developers with preparing and reviewing project-specific WQMPs.
- cc. Enhanced online watershed maps to assist developers and the public with identifying areas tributary to ~~Impaired~~ ~~Waterbodies~~.
- dd. Developed a BMP design handbook to standardize BMP selection and design in Riverside County.
- ee. Initiated development of an enhanced BMP Design Handbook to provide additional guidance for LID and post-construction BMP design.
- ff. Participation in the Storm Water Monitoring Coalition (~~SMC~~) efforts to evaluate LID options and establish guidance for BMP implementation for Southern California areas.

Deleted: p

Deleted: i

Deleted: i

Deleted: s

Deleted: i

Deleted: w

Deleted:

Deleted: a

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

~~Tentative Second~~ Public Draft  
~~October 22, 2009~~

gg. Participation in ~~Southern California Coastal Water Research Project's~~  
~~SCCWRP's~~ Hydromodification studies to develop scientifically based  
design guidance for Southern California.

Deleted: h

hh. Initiated cooperative program with Environmental Health to promote  
Environmental Enhancement Projects in lieu of fines for violations of  
environmental laws. This initiative resulted in the billboard advertising  
campaign to promote appropriate BMPs for gas stations and garages.

ii. Prepared a one-year evaluation of Litter Management BMPs. This  
evaluation assessed the relative efficiency and cost effectiveness of  
anthropogenic litter management BMPs including: street sweeping, catch  
basin cleaning, deployment of trash receptacles, public education, and  
MS4 maintenance. As a result, a Litter Removal Inspection Form was  
developed that assist~~ed~~ the Permittees in identifying and prioritizing areas  
with litter problems. The Permittees augmented the litter management  
programs including employee/contractor training, industrial/commercial  
activity inspections, recycling programs including bulk-item collection,  
participation in watershed clean-up efforts, and illegal dumping retrieval.

Deleted: s

jj. The RCFC&WCD coordinated GIS-based maps for Permittee MS4  
facilities. The MS4 maps are updated annually with new information  
provided by the Permittees as part of the ~~Annual R~~eporting process. The  
GIS layers are also now available on the RCFC&WCD's website through  
an internet GIS browser.

Deleted: a

Deleted: r

kk. Updated Model Facilities Pollution Prevention Plan for Permittee facilities  
not requiring coverage under the General Permit for Storm Water  
Discharges Associated with Industrial Activities (General Industrial  
Permit).

ll. The Permittees completed a MS4 assessment in 2004 to identify  
opportunities for incorporation of regional BMP retrofits within the limits of  
existing infrastructure.

~~mm.~~ Pursued a Proposition 13 Grant, through the Santa Ana Watershed  
Project Authority, to develop a LID BMP Demonstration and Testing  
Facility. RCFC&WCD has continued to develop this project and plans to  
start construction this winter despite the current freeze on new grant  
projects.

## **B. PRIOR TERM PERMITS - WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS**

An accurate and quantifiable measurement of the impact of the above stated Urban  
Runoff management programs is difficult, due to a variety of reasons, such as the  
variability in chemical water quality data, the incremental nature of BMP  
implementation, lack of baseline monitoring data, and the existence of some of the  
programs and policies prior to initiation of formal Urban Runoff management  
programs. There are generally two accepted methodologies for assessing water  
quality improvements: (1) conventional monitoring such as chemical-specific water

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

~~Tentative Second~~ Public Draft  
~~October 22, 2009~~

quality monitoring; and (2) non-conventional monitoring, such as monitoring of the amount of household hazardous waste collected and disposed off at appropriate disposal sites, the amount of used oil collected, and the amount of anthropogenic debris removed from the MS4, etc.

The Permittees' water quality monitoring data submitted to date document a number of violations of Basin Plan ~~water quality objectives~~ **Water Quality Objectives** for various Urban Runoff-related ~~P~~ **P**ollutants; the most notable among these violations was fecal coliform bacteria. Where these violations have resulted in the development of TMDLs for the ~~Middle Santa Ana River~~ **MSAR**, this Order requires the Permittees named in the TMDL: to comply with the WLAs for bacteria consistent with the Implementation Plan requirements defined in the ~~Middle Santa Ana River~~ **MSAR Bacterial Indicator** TMDL.

Deleted: p

During the prior MS4 Permit terms, there was an increased focus on watershed management initiatives and coordination among the MS4 permittees in Orange, Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. These efforts resulted in a number of regional monitoring programs and other coordinated program and policy developments. The Principal Permittee continues to be an active participant in the ~~Storm Water Quality Standards Task Force (SWQSTF)~~, the Canyon Lake/Lake Elsinore nutrient TMDL, the ~~Middle Santa Ana River (MSAR)~~ Bacterial Indicator TMDL, and the ~~SMC Storm Water Monitoring Coalition~~ studies. In addition to the TMDL implementation and monitoring activities, the Permittees participate in the Regional Integrated Freshwater Bioassessment Monitoring Program, the BMP Effectiveness Project assessing the effectiveness of LID techniques. Riverside and San Bernardino MS4 Programs are also coordinating on the development of several outreach programs.

It is anticipated that with continued implementation of the revised DAMP, the programs proposed in the ROWD incorporated into this Order and other requirements specified in this Order, the goals and objectives of the storm water regulations will be met, including protection of the Beneficial Uses of all Receiving Waters.

## VII. FUTURE DIRECTION/2007 ROWD

A. Recognizing the significant resources utilized in developing the 2002 MS4 Permit and the significant commitment the Permittees are making to address water quality ~~impairments, including those identified in the 2006 303(d) List as high~~ priority for establishment of TMDLs, the Permittees proposed in the 2007 ROWD to maintain the fundamental structure and content of the 2002 MS4 Permit and the 2005 DAMP with modifications to reflect:

Deleted: i

1. Removed descriptions of studies that have been completed;

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

~~Tentative Second~~ Public Draft  
~~October 22, 2009~~

2. Updated references to related orders by the Santa Ana Regional Board and State Board;
3. Adoption of TMDL requirements;
4. Evolution of compliance programs;
5. Further standardization and definition of terms;
6. Consolidation of similar compliance requirements [training requirements, reporting requirements, IC/ID requirements] to simplify the Order, increase readability and prevent the need for duplicative language;
7. Deletion of requirements in the 2002 MS4 Permit that described the development of compliance program elements which were incorporated into the 2005 DAMP;
8. Development of LIPs by the Permittees during the fourth term Order;
9. Addition of Permittee coverage under the Small Linear Underground Projects (State Board Order No. 2003-0007-DWQ, NPDES No. CAS000005) and Utility Vaults (State Board Order No. 2006-0008-DWQ, NPDES No. CAG990002) General Permits;
10. Recognition that the Municipal Facilities Strategy and Enforcement Compliance Strategies have been incorporated into the DAMP; and
11. Santa Ana Regional Board staff comments received by the Permittees during the third term permit, including comments received during the January 22, 2007 ROWD kick-off meeting regarding topics such as LID, Hydromodification, LIPs, etc.

Deleted: h

B. In addition, the 2007 ROWD proposed continuing with the 2005 DAMP with some revisions. Based on an effectiveness assessment analysis, the following significant changes were incorporated into the Permittees 2007 draft DAMP compliance programs:

1. The Permittees proposed to complete preparation of LIPs within 12 months of Order adoption. The Permittees propose to develop LIPs that will:
  - a. Specify how each program element of the DAMP shall be implemented;
  - b. Describe the ordinances, plans, policies, procedures, and tools (e.g., checklists, forms, educational materials, etc.) used to execute the DAMP;
  - c. Identify the organizational units responsible for implementation of each program element;
  - d. Establish internal reporting requirements to ensure and promote accountability; and
  - e. Describe an adaptive method of evaluation and assessment of program effectiveness for the purpose of identifying program improvements.

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009

2. The final report “BMP Siting Study for the Santa Ana Permit Area” was released in May 2005. The sites identified in this study are likely to be further evaluated for opportunities to implement Regional BMPs necessary to comply with existing and future TMDLs.

Deleted: C

3. Proposed revisions to the 2002 MS4 Permit provisions to reflect the unified IC/ID reporting procedures currently contained within the DAMP for simplicity and clarity.

C. Regional Board Approach to Consolidation of Overlapping NPDES Permit Requirements

1. During the third term MS4 Permit, the Permittees reviewed the applicability of the General Permit-Small Linear Underground Projects (State Board Order No. 2003-0007-DWQ, NPDES No. CAS000005), the General Permit-De Minimus Discharges (Order No. R8-2003-0061 as amended by Order Nos. R8-2005-0041 and R8-2006-0004), and the General Permit-Utility Vaults (Order No. 2006-0008-DWQ, NPDES No. CAG990002) to their activities such as hydrant flushing, maintenance on potable water supply system(s), construction dewatering, and the short-term and intermittent discharges from the de-watering of utility vaults and underground structures. Since the DAMP incorporates BMPs for the activities covered by these general permits, the Permittees recommended separate coverage under the Small Linear Underground Projects, De Minimus Discharges, or Utility Vaults General Permits was not necessary. This Order now includes coverage for De Minimus discharges from Permittee-owned facilities and activities specifically excluded from coverage under the General Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges to Surface Waters that Pose an Insignificant (De Minimus) Threat to Water Quality, NPDES NO. CAG998001, Order No. R8-2009-0003. Permittees shall continue to obtain separate coverage for activities covered by the Small Linear Underground Projects and Utility Vaults General Permits, unless these permits are incorporated into the General Construction Permit.

Deleted: p

Deleted: p

2. Specific identification of the types of discharges that must have coverage under the General De Minimus Permit and the General Construction Permit, is included in Section 5 of the 2007 DAMP. This Order requires the Permittees to include a description of those de minimus discharges into the Permittees' LIP, including a Regional Board notification process.

3. Prioritized inspections and monitoring based on sampling and monitoring results and other metrics to help target activities that present the highest risk to water quality.

D. During the fourth term Order, the following revisions to the Public Education and Outreach Program will be priorities:

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009



1. Continue coordination of public education outreach with adjacent MS4s.
2. Continue to evaluate and enhance outreach materials for IC/IDs, nutrients, fertilizers, and pesticides.
3. Continue to focus the Public Education and Outreach Program on the ~~P~~ollutants causing the greatest impacts to water quality, determined by the monitoring results and the list of ~~i~~mpaired ~~W~~aterbodies [303(d) list].

Deleted: p

Deleted: i

Deleted: w

The Permittees have already taken several steps in this direction. For example, the Permittees have provided spray bottles with environmentally friendly pesticide recipes printed on the side to residents at community fairs; the Permittees have developed or are in the process of developing brochures for septic system management, landscape management, and gardening; the Riverside and San Bernardino County Permittees are coordinating on a Curiosity Quest Episode (KVCR Family Show) to promote BMPs for nutrients, fertilizers and pesticides and the Permittees place information in hardware and gardening stores regarding pesticide and fertilizer management. The Permittees also incorporate other materials to address general pollutants of concern.

- E. As a result of continued program effectiveness assessment the Permittees propose to update ~~annual reporting~~ Annual Reporting forms to incorporate specific reporting requirements for all effectiveness assessment metrics.
- F. Enhanced online watershed maps to assist developers and the public with identifying areas tributary to ~~impaired water bodies~~ Impaired Waterbodies.

#### G. WQMP

1. The Permittees committed to maintain the “Frequently Asked Questions” information sheet for priority development projects to assist with the development and implementation of the revised WQMP.
2. The Permittees committed to update the Riverside County Storm Water Quality Best Management Practice Design Handbook to (1) better incorporate LID design concepts, (2) incorporate guidance to describe how developments can offset ~~H~~ydromodification impacts with LID and (3) incorporate additional design guidance to ensure maintainability and functionality of BMPs, throughout the life of the development. This Order further requires the Permittees to revise the WQMP consistent with the requirements of the Order.
3. The Permittees committed to maintain the WQMP template to assist developers with developing a project-specific WQMP.
4. An audit of each of the Permittees’ ~~storm water~~ Urban Runoff management programs during the third term ~~MS4 Permit~~ indicated no clear nexus between the watershed protection principles, including LID techniques, specified in the WQMP and the Permittees’ General Plan or related documents such as

Deleted: h

Deleted: p

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009

Development Standards, Zoning Codes, Conditions of Approval, Project Development Guidance, etc. It appears that many of the existing procedures, Development Standards, Ordinances and Municipal Codes may be barriers to implement LID BMPs. This Order requires the Permittees to facilitate LID techniques specified in this Order.

H. The Regional Board has proposed a revised Notice of Intent and Notice of Termination for Permittee construction projects to assist ~~Santa Ana~~ Regional Board staff with identifying locations and owners of Permittee projects.

I. The Permittees have committed to annual updates to Sanitary Sewer Overflow Procedures to ensure proper contact information for Permittee and outside agencies.

#### J. WATERSHED APPROACH

1. TMDL ~~WLAs~~ for bacterial indicator in the ~~Middle Santa Ana River watershed~~ MSAR subwatershed and nutrients in the Canyon Lake and Lake Elsinore subwatershed are incorporated into this Order. (See Section V.C). The Permittees support TMDL implementation and agreed to participate in a comprehensive water quality monitoring program to ensure that Urban Runoff meets the ~~water quality objectives~~ Water Quality Objectives identified in the Basin Plan and are consistent with the WLAs specified in the TMDLs. This Order requires that, consistent with the requirements of the respective TMDL Implementation Plans ~~and this Order~~, the Permittees use the water quality monitoring of ~~urban runoff~~ Urban Runoff to evaluate the effectiveness of the BMP ~~and programs and demonstrate Permittees' progress towards compliance with the WLAs by the date specified in the TMDLs.~~

2. The USEPA has recommended a shift to watershed-based NPDES permitting<sup>8</sup> and watershed approach<sup>9</sup> to CWA programs, including NPDES programs. The Permittees and the Regional Board also recognize that a watershed-based approach is ~~critical~~ expected to be effective in controlling ~~P~~ Pollutants in Urban Runoff. Consistent with this approach, this Order requires the Permittees to develop and implement programs that integrate Hydromodification and water quality management strategies with land use planning policies, ordinances, and plans within each jurisdiction. A *watershed approach* considers the diverse ~~P~~ollutant sources and stressors and watershed goals within a defined

Deleted: p

Deleted: h

Deleted: p

<sup>8</sup> EPA: Watershed-based NPDES permitting is a process that emphasizes addressing all stressors within a hydrologically-defined drainage basin, rather than addressing individual pollutant sources on a discharge-by-discharge basis.

<sup>9</sup> EPA (1996a): "The watershed approach is a coordinating framework for environmental management that focuses public and private sector efforts to address the highest priority problems within hydrologically defined geographic areas, taking into consideration both ground and surface water flow."

Tentative Second Public Draft

October 22, 2009

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

geographic area (i.e., watershed boundaries). A watershed approach has three basic components:

- a. *Geographic Focus:* Watersheds are nature's boundaries. They are the land areas that drain to surface waterbodies, and they generally include lakes, rivers, estuaries, wetlands, streams, and the surrounding landscape. Groundwater recharge areas are also considered.
- b. *Sound Management Techniques Based on Strong Science and Data:* Sound scientific data, tools, and techniques are critical to evaluate the process. Actions taken include characterizing priority watershed problems and solutions, developing and implementing action plans, and evaluating their effectiveness within the watershed.
- c. *Partnerships/Stakeholder Involvement:* Watersheds transcend political, social, and economic boundaries. Therefore, it is important to involve all the affected interests in designing and implementing goals for the watershed. Watershed teams may include representatives from all levels of government, public interest groups, industry, academic institutions, private landowners, concerned citizens, and others.

There are two major sub-watersheds in Riverside County within the Permit Area – The ~~Middle Santa Ana River watershed~~ **MSAR subwatershed**, consisting of the portions of the Permit Area that drain to Reaches 3 and 4 of the Santa Ana River, and the San Jacinto River **sub-watershed**, which consists of the portions of the Permit Area that drain to Lake Elsinore. The Permittees participate in the ~~Middle Santa Ana River~~ **MSAR** TMDL Task Force and the Lake Elsinore and Canyon Lake TMDL Task Forces, which are stakeholder driven, watershed based efforts to address Pollutants of Concern in the respective sub-watersheds. The Permittees have also implemented several stakeholder driven, watershed based conservation programs such as the Special Area Management Plan, the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Conservation Plan, the San Jacinto River Integrated Watershed Management Plan and the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority One Water One Watershed Plan.

Deleted: T

These efforts are also addressed and discussed in the DAMP, which integrates these efforts into a coherent and uniform compliance program to protect Receiving Waters. Due to economies of scale and the fact that many of the Permittees have jurisdiction in both sub-watersheds, the Permittees have opted to continue to implement uniform MS4 Permit compliance programs across the entire Permit Area (for example ~~municipal Permittee~~ training programs educate inspectors about the impacts and sources of pathogens and nutrients as opposed to offering separate sub-watershed specific training programs for the San Jacinto and ~~Middle Santa Ana River~~ **MSAR** sub-watersheds). The Permittees have indicated that as source assessments and monitoring data results from the aforementioned watershed

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

~~Tentative Second~~ Public Draft  
~~October 22, 2009~~

efforts produce findings regarding potential urban sources of Pollutants of Concern, that they may opt, in the future, to develop specific action plans for the ~~Middle Santa Ana River~~ MSAR and San Jacinto River sub-watersheds, or potentially even tributaries thereof. If so, the DAMP will be appropriately modified to clarify the sub-watershed specific components.

The Permittees also currently implement interim Hydromodification criteria and have committed to revising their Hydromodification management programs based on studies currently being conducted by the ~~Southern California Coastal Watershed Research Project~~ SCCWRP. This Order requires the Permittees to continue to pursue these watershed planning efforts and enhance them as appropriate to address Pollutants of Concern.

Deleted: h

Deleted: h

J. To promote program transparency, ~~this Order requires~~ each Permittee proposed to develop its own local implementation plan (LIP) that specifies:

- Specifies how each program element of the DAMP shall be implemented;
- Describes the ordinances, plans, policies, procedures, and tools (e.g., checklists, forms, educational materials, etc.) used to execute the DAMP;
- Identifies the organizational units responsible for implementation of each program element;
- Establishes internal reporting requirements to ensure and promote accountability; and
- Describes an adaptive method of evaluation and assessment of program effectiveness for the purpose of identifying program improvements.

Deleted: y

Deleted: y

K. The audits conducted by Regional Board staff have also shown a significant deficiency in measuring program effectiveness. This Order requires quantifiable measures for evaluating program effectiveness.

L. The above-mentioned strategies for the fourth term Order build upon and continue the programs and policies developed by the Permittees during the prior MS4 Permit terms as described in Sections VI and VII above.

Deleted: p

M. A combination of these programs and policies and the requirements specified in this Order should ensure control of Pollutants in Urban Runoff from the MS4 owned and/or controlled by the Permittees.

Deleted: p

Deleted: s

## VIII. ORDER REQUIREMENTS AND PROVISIONS

The legislative history of storm water statutes (1987 CWA Amendments), USEPA regulations (40CFR Parts 122, 123, and 124), and clarifications issued by the State

Tentative Second Public Draft

October 22, 2009

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

Board (State Board Orders No. WQ 91-03 and WQ 92-04) indicate that a non-traditional NPDES permitting strategy was anticipated for regulating Urban Runoff. Due to the economic and technical infeasibility of full-scale end-of-pipe treatments and the complexity of Urban Runoff quality and quantity, MS4 permits generally include narrative requirements for the implementation of BMPs in place of ~~Numeric~~ ~~Effluent~~ ~~Limits~~.

Deleted: n

Deleted: e

Deleted: l

The requirements included in this Order are meant to specify those management practices, control techniques and system design and engineering methods that will result in protection of the Beneficial Uses of the Receiving Waters consistent with the MEP standard. State Board (Orders No. WQ 98-01 and WQ 99-05) concluded that MS4s must meet the technology-based MEP standard and ~~water quality standards (water quality objectives and Beneficial Uses)~~ Water Quality Standards. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit subsequently held that strict compliance with ~~water quality standards~~ Water Quality Standards in MS4 permits is at the discretion of the local permitting agency. ~~Any requirements included in the Order that are more stringent than the federal storm water regulations are in accordance with the CWA Section 402(p)(3)(iii), and the California Water Code Section 13377 and are consistent with the Regional Board's interpretation of the requisite MEP standard.~~

The ROWD included a discussion of the current status of Riverside County's Urban Runoff management program and the proposed programs and policies for the next five years (fourth term Order). This Order incorporates these documents and specifies performance commitments for specific elements of the Permittees Urban Runoff management program.

This Order recognizes the significant progress made by the Permittees during the first three MS4 Permit terms in implementing the storm water regulations. This Order also recognizes regional and innovative solutions to such a complex problem, addresses deficiencies in the Permittees' Urban Runoff programs observed during the audits conducted by Regional Board staff, and considers comments by the USEPA on other draft MS4 Permits. This Order specifies quantifiable performance measures to determine compliance and assess the effectiveness of the Urban Runoff programs. This Order incorporates an integrated watershed approach in solving water quality and ~~Hydromodification impacts resulting from urbanization and aims to promote LID techniques as a key element to mitigate impacts from New Development and Significant Redevelopment projects.~~ The proposed Order also requires the Permittees to ~~attain~~ implement TMDL WLA through ~~iterative~~ BMP programs ~~as~~ required in the respective approved TMDL Implementation Plans ~~and through implementation of the program elements and BMPs specified in the DAMP, LIPs and this Order (See Section V.C).~~ The goal of these programs and policies that are included in this Order is to achieve and maintain ~~water quality standards~~ Water Quality Standards in the Receiving Waters.

Deleted: h

The essential components of the Urban Runoff management program, as established by federal regulations [40 CFR 122.26(d)] are: (i) Adequate Legal Authority, (ii) Fiscal Resources, (iii) Storm Water Quality Management Program (SQMP) - (Public

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

~~Tentative Second~~ Public Draft  
~~October 22, 2009~~



Information and Participation Program, Industrial/Commercial Facilities Program, Development Planning Program, Development Construction Program, Public Agency Activities Program, ~~Illicit Connection and Illicit Discharges IC/IDs~~ Elimination Program), and (iv) Monitoring and Reporting Program. The major sections of the requirements in this Order include: I. Facility Information, II. Findings, III. Permittee Responsibilities; IV. Discharge Prohibitions; V. Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications, VI. Receiving Water Limitations; VII. Legal Authority/Enforcement; VIII. Illicit Connections/Illegal Discharges; Litter, Debris and Trash Control; IX. Sewage Spills, Infiltration into MS4 Systems from Leaking Sanitary Sewer Lines, Septic System Failures, and Portable Toilet Discharges; X. Municipal Inspection Program, XI. New Development (including significant re-development); XII. Public Education and Outreach; XIII. Permittee Facilities and Activities, XIV. Training Program For Storm Water Managers, Planners, Inspectors And Municipal Contractors; XV. Notification Requirements; XVI. Program Management/Damp Review; XVII. Fiscal Resources, XVIII. Monitoring and Reporting Requirements; XIX. Provisions; XX Permit Modification, XXI. Permit Expiration and Renewal.

These programs and policies are intended to improve Urban Runoff quality and protect the ~~beneficial uses~~ Beneficial Uses of ~~receiving waters~~ Receiving Waters of the ~~region~~ Permit Area.

#### A. RESPONSIBILITIES

The responsibilities of the Principal Permittee are to coordinate the overall Urban Runoff management program and the Co-Permittees are responsible for managing the Urban Runoff program within their jurisdictions as detailed in the ROWD and the proposed Order, Order No. R8-2009-0033.

The existing Implementation Agreement needs to be revised to include the cities that were not signatories to this Agreement. The Order requires that a copy of the signature page and any revisions to the Agreement be included in the specified Annual Report.

#### B. DISCHARGE PROHIBITIONS

In accordance with CWA Section 402(p)(3)(B)(ii), this Order prohibits the discharge of non-storm water to the MS4s, with a few exceptions. The specified exceptions are consistent with 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B)(1). If the Permittees or the Executive Officer determines that any of the exempted non-storm water discharges is a significant source of ~~Pollutants~~, a separate NPDES permit or coverage under the Regional Board's De Minimus permit will be required.

Deleted: p

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009



### C. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND DISCHARGE SPECIFICATIONS, INCLUDING WASTE LOAD ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCHARGES TO 303(d) LISTED WATERBODIES WITH ADOPTED TMDLS

The Order clarifies allowed discharges and those discharges (only from Permittee owned or operated facilities and activities) allowed only if certain discharge specifications are met, such as those covered under the De Minimus Permit. These discharges should be consistent with the Regional Board's General De Minimus Permit for Discharges to Surface Waters, Order No. R8-2009-0003, NPDES No. CAG 998001. Permittees de minimus discharges covered under this Order include: 1) dewatering wastes from subterranean seepage, except for discharges from utility vaults; 2) discharges resulting from hydrostatic testing of vessels, pipelines, tanks, etc.; 3) discharges resulting from the maintenance of potable water supply pipelines, tanks, reservoirs, etc.; 4) discharges resulting from the disinfection of potable water supply pipelines, tanks, reservoirs, etc.; 5) discharges from potable water supply systems resulting from initial system startup, routine startup, sampling of influent flow, system failures, pressure releases, etc.; 6) discharges from fire hydrant testing or flushing; 7) air conditioning condensate; 8) swimming pool discharges; 9) discharges resulting from diverted stream flows; and 10) Construction dewatering wastes. The DAMP and the LIP are required to be revised to incorporate information regarding Permittees' de minimus discharges.

~~This Order requires Permittees to comply with established TMDL WLAs specified for Urban Runoff by implementing the necessary BMPs. NPDES regulations at 40 CFR 122.44(d)(vii)(B) require that permits be consistent with WLAs approved by the USEPA. WLAs in adopted TMDLs for the Middle Santa River (MSAR) Watershed Bacteria Indicator, and the Lake Elsinore/Canyon Lake (San Jacinto Watershed) Nutrient TMDL are included in this Order as Water Quality Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELS). However, since the compliance dates of the adopted TMDLs are beyond the expected 5-year duration of this NPDES permit, this Order requires Permittees to establish BMP-based reduction goals and demonstrate through monitoring programs specified in the TMDL Implementation Plans and this Order the effectiveness of the BMPs implemented in reducing the Pollutants of Concern.~~

This Order requires Permittees to implement established TMDL WLAs specified for Urban Runoff through an iterative BMP approach (see Section V.C above).

### D. RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS

Receiving Water Limitations are included to ensure that discharges of Urban Runoff from MS4s do not cause or contribute to violations of applicable ~~water quality~~ standards Water Quality Standards in Receiving Waters. The compliance strategy

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

for Receiving Water Limitations is consistent with the USEPA and State Board guidance and recognizes the complexity of Urban Runoff management.

This Order requires the Permittees to meet water quality standards in Receiving Waters in accordance with USEPA requirements, as specified in State Board Order No. WQ 99-05. If ~~water quality standards~~ Water Quality Standards are not met through implementation of certain BMPs, the Permittees are required to re-evaluate the programs and policies and to propose additional BMPs. Compliance determination will be based on this iterative BMP implementation process.

## E. LEGAL AUTHORITY/ENFORCEMENT

Each Permittee has adopted ~~a number of~~ ordinances, municipal codes, and other regulations to establish legal authority to control discharges to the MS4s and to enforce these regulations as specified in 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(I)(B, C, E, and F. The Permittees are required to enforce these ordinances and to take enforcement actions against violators (40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A-D)).

The enforcement activities undertaken by a majority of the Permittees have consisted primarily of Notices of Violation, which act to educate the public on the environmental consequences of ~~Illegal Discharges~~. In the case of the County, additional action has sometimes included recovery of investigation and clean-up costs from the responsible parties. In the event of egregious or repeated violations, the option exists for a referral to the County District Attorney for possible prosecution or to the Regional Board for enforcement under the California Water Code or the CWA. In order to eliminate unauthorized, non-storm water discharges, reduce the amount of ~~Pollutants~~ commingling with Urban Runoff and thereby protect water quality, an additional level of enforcement is required between Notices of Violation and District Attorney referrals.

The third term ~~MS4 Permit~~ required the Permittees to establish the authority and resources to administer either civil or criminal fines and/or penalties for violations of their ~~local water quality ordinances~~ Storm Water Ordinances. The Permittees now have this authority for penalties. Within the fourth term Order, Permittees are required to exercise this authority by developing an enforcement program to be administered within the industrial, commercial and construction elements of their Urban Runoff management programs. The enforcement program has been required to be included as an update to each Permittee's LIP. The effectiveness of this program must be documented in the Annual Reports submitted by the Permittees. However, it is acknowledged that once cases have been referred to the District Attorney or Environmental Crimes Task Force, etc. for prosecution, case details are confidential.

Deleted: i

Deleted: d

Deleted: p

Deleted: p

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009

The fourth term Order further requires the Permittees to document and implement progressive and decisive enforcement actions, evaluate the effectiveness of their enforcement program and sanctions by tracking compliance and evaluating the amount of time to return to compliance.

This Order requires the Permittees to include in the LIP their legal authority and mechanisms to implement the various program elements required by this Order to properly manage, reduce and mitigate potential ~~Pollutant sources~~ within each Permittee's jurisdiction. The LIP shall include citations of appropriate local ordinances, identification of departmental jurisdictions and key personnel in the implementation and enforcement of those ordinances. The LIP shall include procedures, tools and timeframes for progressive enforcement actions and procedures for tracking compliance.

Deleted: p

#### F. ILLICIT CONNECTIONS/ILLEGAL DISCHARGES; LITTER, DEBRIS AND TRASH CONTROL

Federal regulation, 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B), requires the Permittees to eliminate illicit discharges to the MS4s. The Permittees have completed a survey of the MS4 and eliminated or permitted all identified ~~Illicit Connections~~. The Permittees have also established a program to address ~~Illegal Discharges~~ and a mechanism to respond to spills and leaks and other incidents of discharges to the MS4.

Deleted: i

Deleted: c

Deleted: i

Deleted: d

The Permittees currently have several programs to address IC/IDs:

1. The Permittees operate a toll free phone line, provide e-mail access for filing complaints and take direct calls regarding IC/ID reports from third parties. These reports are investigated by Permittee staff and reported in IC/ID investigation forms. All Permittee public education outreach materials promote the use of these reporting mechanisms.
2. ~~Permittee staff receive training on identification and reporting of IC/IDs to appropriate Permittee staff.~~ These reports are investigated and reported in IC/ID reporting forms.
3. The Permittees conduct industrial, commercial and construction inspections to identify potential IC/IDs. The outcomes of these inspections are reported in inspection reporting databases.
4. The Permittees contribute funds to the County Hazardous Materials Response Team to train and educate them to handle ~~Illegal Discharges~~ or accidental hazardous waste discharges so as to prevent IC/IDs. A summary of HAZMAT activities is provided in the Permittees Annual Reports.
5. The RCFC&WCD monitors Office of Emergency Service reports for potential IC/ID incidents and investigates them as appropriate. Results are reported in the RCFC&WCD complaint call database and reported to the Permittees as appropriate.

Deleted: s

Deleted: i

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

~~Tentative Second~~ Public Draft  
~~October 22, 2009~~

6. The RCFC&WCD has developed an online GIS tool that identifies the location of District and Permittee facilities to facilitate IC/ID investigations and response.
7. The Permittees have developed a Sanitary Sewer Overflow Procedure to limit the potential for sewage spills to the MS4.
8. RCFC&WCD, as Principal Permittee, has dedicated staff that conducts dry weather monitoring and also evaluates RCFC&WCD ~~MS4s~~ **MS4 facilities** for maintenance problems and/or IC/IDs. Detected IC/IDs from monitoring data or field inspections are reported to the District's NPDES section, logged into RCFC&WCDs complaint database, and reported to the appropriate Permittee for follow up action.

However, with a few exceptions, program evaluations conducted during the third term MS4 Permit showed that this program element is primarily complaint driven or an incidental component of municipal inspections or MS4 inspections for a number of Permittees. This Order requires the Permittees to ensure their LIPs describe each Permittee's plan for focused, systematic IC/ID investigations, outfall reconnaissance surveys, indicator monitoring, and track their sources<sup>10</sup>. A proactive illicit discharge detection and elimination (IDDE) program should be integrated with other LIP program elements as appropriate including: mapping of the Permittees' MS4 to track sources, aerial photography, Permittee inspection programs for construction, industrial, commercial, MS4, ~~Permittee municipal~~ facilities, etc., watershed monitoring, public education and outreach, ~~pollution prevention~~ **Pollution Prevention**, and rapid assessment of stream corridors to identify dry weather flows and illegal dumping.

#### **G. SEWAGE SPILLS, INFILTRATION INTO MS4 SYSTEMS FROM LEAKING SANITARY SEWER LINES, SEPTIC SYSTEM FAILURES, AND PORTABLE TOILET DISCHARGES**

Federal regulation, 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B)(4), requires the Permittees to develop procedures to prevent, contain, and respond to spills that may discharge into the MS4s. The Permittees have already developed a program to address various types of spills to the MS4s. This Order requires the Permittees to continue to implement the unified sewer response plans in collaboration with the local sanitary sewer system operators. To facilitate swift response actions, the Permittees are required to provide 24-hour access to MS4s to the sanitary sewer system operators. The Permittees should also work cooperatively with the sanitary sewer system operators to determine if exfiltration from leaking sanitary sewer lines is causing or contributing to Urban Runoff ~~P~~ollution problems. In addition, the Permittees are required to control infiltration or seepage from sanitary sewers to the MS4s through routine preventive maintenance of the MS4 (40 CFR

Deleted: p

<sup>10</sup> Table 2: Land uses, Generating Sites and Activities that Produce Indirect Discharges from IDDE, A Guidance Manual for Program Development and Technical Assessments, October 2004 CWP.

~~Tentative Second~~ Public Draft

~~October 22, 2009~~

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B)(7)). This Order also requires the Permittees to implement control measures and procedures to prevent, respond to, contain and clean up all sewage and other spills from sources such as portable toilets and septic systems.

On May 2, 2006, the State Board issued the Statewide General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems, Water Quality Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ (SSO Order) to address proper management and operation of sewer collection systems and to control sanitary sewer overflows. It requires dischargers/enrollees to develop and implement a written Sewer System Management Plan (SSMP) approved by the discharger's governing board and report sewer spills through an on-line reporting system. This Order requires the Permittees have reviewed the unified sewage spill response plan developed during the third term MS4 Permit with the local sewerage agencies and determined that it is consistent with the requirements of the SSO Order. This Order also requires each Permittee to include in its LIP the interagency or interdepartmental sewer spill response coordination and responsibilities.

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: p

The MS4 program audits indicated that a majority of the Permittees with septic systems have inadequate information with regard to the number and location of those systems within their jurisdiction. This Order requires the Permittees with septic systems to develop within 2 years of adoption of this Order, an inventory of septic systems within its jurisdiction and establish a program to ensure that failure rates are minimized.

#### H. MUNICIPAL INSPECTION PROGRAM;

Federal regulations, 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A-D), require the Permittees to inventory, prioritize and inspect industrial, construction and commercial facilities. This Order requires the Co-Permittees to continue inspections of construction, industrial, and commercial activities within their jurisdiction in order to control the Pollutants entering the MS4. The Co-Permittees will continue to maintain the inventory of facilities and sites in the above categories, prioritize these facilities based on threat to water quality, and perform regular inspections to insure compliance with local ordinances. While initial observations of non-compliance may result in 'educational' type enforcement, repeated non-compliance will result in more disciplinary forms of enforcement, such as monetary penalties, stop work orders or permit revocation.

Deleted: p

An evaluation of Permittee inspection programs during the third term MS4 permit indicated certain deficiencies in the commercial, industrial and construction programs of some of the Permittees. In many instances, program documentation of progressive enforcement and facilities' return to compliance were not properly documented. This Order requires Permittees to document inspections and enforcement and evaluate the effectiveness of their inspection and enforcement program by tracking the time for facilities to return to compliance. The Permittees who do not have an internet accessible database are required to initiate quarterly

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009



reporting and update of the inventory, inspection and enforcement database for facilities within their jurisdiction.

In order to address discharges to the MS4 from residential sources, the fourth term ~~MS4 Permit Order~~ requires the Permittees to develop and implement a residential program to prevent residential discharges from causing or contributing to a violation of ~~water quality standards~~ Water Quality Standards in the Receiving Waters (40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A)).

#### I. NEW DEVELOPMENT (INCLUDING SIGNIFICANT REDEVELOPMENT)

Federal regulation, 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A)(2), requires the Permittees to develop a comprehensive master plan to address discharges from New Development and Significant Redevelopment projects. During the third term MS4 ~~Permit~~, the Permittees revised their ~~new development~~ New development guidelines to address water quality and ~~Hydromodification~~ impacts resulting from urbanization. A WQMP for Urban Runoff was approved by the Regional Board in 2004 and became effective in 2005. This Order requires the Permittees to continue to work towards the goal of restoring and preserving the natural hydrologic cycles in proposed urban developments by reviewing and approving project-specific WQMPs to address post-construction impacts. The WQMP should be designed to address water quality impacts, including hydrologic conditions of concern (HCOC), from New Development and Significant Redevelopment projects through: (1) site design BMPs, including LID techniques; (2) ~~source control~~ Source Control BMPs; and (3) ~~treatment control~~ Treatment Control BMPs. This Order recognizes the importance of LID techniques to minimize the impact of urbanization on water quality. This Order requires the project proponents to infiltrate, harvest and reuse, evapotranspire, or bio-treat the volume of runoff from a 24-hour, 85<sup>th</sup> percentile storm event where feasible. The Order also provides alternatives and in-lieu programs for project sites where infiltration, harvesting and re-use, evapotranspiration and bio-treatment are not feasible.

Program evaluations conducted during the third term MS4 ~~Permit~~ indicated a need for establishing a clear nexus between the watershed protection principles (including LID) and the planning and approval processes of the Permittees. This Order requires the Permittees to review and revise their Development Standards, Zoning Codes, Conditions of Approval, Development Project Guidance, ordinances, and other related documents to identify and eliminate barriers to incorporate watershed protection principles.

The Southern California Monitoring Coalition (SMC), including project lead agency, the San Bernardino County Flood Control District, in collaboration with SMC member, SCCWRP and the California Storm Water Quality Association (CASQA), is developing a LID Manual for Southern California with funding from the State Board, CASQA and other sources. This manual will be incorporated into the

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009

Deleted: p

Deleted: h

Deleted:

Deleted: p

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009



CASQA BMP Handbooks. The Permittees are encouraged to utilize the manual as a resource for proper LID design and implementation techniques.

Program evaluations have also ~~shown deficiencies suggested a need for~~ improvement in the Permittees' inspection, and tracking of post-construction BMPs. This Order requires the Permittees to revise their close-out procedures to include field verification that site design, ~~source control~~ Source Control and ~~treatment~~ Treatment Control BMPs are operational and consistent with the approved WQMP.

This Order incorporates new project categories and revised thresholds for several categories of ~~new development~~ New Development and ~~Significant R~~ Significant Redevelopment projects that trigger the requirement for a WQMP. New project categories include streets, roads and highways of 5,000 square feet or more of paved surface and retail gasoline outlets (RGOs) with 5,000 square feet or more with 100 or more average daily vehicle traffic. The threshold criteria that trigger the WQMP requirement for non-residential commercial/industrial construction projects have been reduced from 100,000 square feet to 10,000 square feet or more of impervious surface. The threshold for residential subdivision projects has also been revised from 10 units or more to a threshold of 10,000 square feet or more of impervious surface.

This Order incorporates new project categories and revised thresholds for several categories of new development and redevelopment projects that trigger the requirement for a WQMP. The 2008 National Research Council (NRC) report<sup>11</sup> indicates that roads and parking lots constitute as much as 70% of total impervious cover in ultra-urban landscape, and as much as 80% of the directly connected impervious cover. Roads tend to capture and export more storm water pollutants than other impervious covers. As such, roads are included as a priority development category for which WQMPs are required. The NRC report also indicates that there is a direct relationship between impervious cover and the biological condition of downstream receiving waters. The Permittees are required to address HCOC from New Development and Significant Redevelopment projects to minimize downstream impacts. Private New Development and Significant Redevelopment projects incorporating roads typically allow road runoff to be addressed as part of the overall water quality strategy for the larger common plans of development. Permittee streets, roads and highways capital projects have special limitations. For example, the footprint of street, road and highway capital projects is often limited and may have hydraulic constraints due to lack of underground storm drain systems that would otherwise be necessary to hydraulically facilitate treatment of runoff. There are also limitations specified in state and federal design and code specifications that may limit or prohibit BMPs. Permittees may also be subject to flow diversion liability and limited road maintenance budgets and equipment. Street, road and highway projects that function as part of the MS4 also receive runoff and associated Pollutants from both

Deleted: r

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

<sup>11</sup> National Research Council Report (2008), [http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record\\_id=12465](http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=12465)

existing urban areas and other external sources, including adjacent land use activities, aerial deposition, brake pad and tire wear and other sources that may be outside the Co-Permittee's authority to regulate and/or economic or technological ability to control. These offsite flows can overwhelm Treatment Control BMPs designed to address the footprint (consistent with the typical requirements for a WQMP) of street, road or highway capital projects incorporating curb and gutter as part of its storm water conveyance function. Despite these limitations, the Regional Board finds that Permittee construction of streets, roads and highway capital projects may provide an opportunity to address Pollutant loads from existing urban areas. However, due to the nature of the facilities and projects, it would be unduly burdensome for the Co-Permittees to maintain WQMP documents for transportation projects (in addition to Facility Pollution Prevention Plans and other overlapping requirements of this Order). The Permittees are therefore not required to prepare WQMP documents for street, road and highway capital projects, but instead are required to develop equivalent documents that include site specific consideration utilizing BMP guidance to address street, roads and highway capital project runoff to the MEP.

**Deleted:** The NRC report also indicates that there is a direct relationship between impervious cover and the biological condition of downstream receiving waters. The Permittees are required to address HCOC from New Development and Significant Redevelopment projects to minimize downstream impacts.

As public works, streets, roads and highway projects are the only facilities typically captured by the new WQMP category, and these projects typically have unique constraints that make them difficult to address through the WQMP process, a separate set of requirements has been established for addressing this category of development. Roads that are typically constructed as part of a development are typically incorporated into the broader WQMP for the development activity, providing more options for mitigation via the WQMP process.

Consistent with a long term holistic approach to address water quality and Hydromodification impacts resulting from urbanization, this Order requires Permittees to continue to develop tools that facilitate integration, to the extent practicable, of water quality, stream protection, storm water management and re-use strategies with land use planning policies, ordinances, and plans within each jurisdiction. These tools should address cumulative impacts of development on vulnerable streams, preserve or restore, consistent with the MEP standard, the structure and function of streams, and protect surface and groundwater quality. The Order specifies that the tools include strategies for addressing (For 303(d) listed waterbodies with adopted TMDLs with or without implementation plans as well as those Impaired Waterbodies without a TMDL. For those 303(d) listed waterbodies Urban Runoff pollutant sources and without a TMDL, the Permittees are required to include provide special protections such as requiring more effective post-construction BMPs focus training programs and develop targeted public outreach that would address the urban source to control the discharge of the pollutants causing the impairment of concern. The Permittees are also required to participate in the TMDL development and implementation.

**Deleted:** h  
**Deleted:**

## J. PUBLIC EDUCATION AND OUTREACH;

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009.

**Deleted:** Preliminary First  
**Deleted:** October 22, 2009  
**Deleted:** July 23, 2009

Federal regulation, 40 CFR 122.26(d)(iv), requires the Permittees to develop a comprehensive storm water management plan with public participation and 40 CFR 122.26(d)(iv)(B)(6) requires the Permittees to engage in outreach activities to facilitate the proper management of ~~P~~ollutants. Public outreach is an important element of the overall urban ~~pollution prevention~~ Pollution Prevention program. The Permittees have committed to implement a strategic and comprehensive public education program to maintain the integrity of the ~~receiving waters~~ Receiving Waters and their ability to sustain Beneficial Uses. The Principal Permittee has taken the lead role in the outreach programs and has targeted various groups including businesses, industry, development, utilities, environmental groups, institutions, homeowners, school children, and the general public. The Permittees have developed a number of educational materials, have established a storm water ~~pollution prevention~~ Pollution Prevention hotline, started an advertising and educational campaign, and distributed public education materials at a number of public events. The Permittees are required to continue these efforts and to expand public participation and education programs.

Deleted: p

The Permittees have already developed BMP fact sheets/~~BMPs~~ to address sources from residential activities such as auto washing and maintenance activities; use and disposal of pesticides, herbicides, fertilizers and household cleaners; and collection and disposal of pet wastes. .

This Order requires the Permittees to ~~review~~ annually review their public education and outreach efforts and revise their activities, if necessary, to address public outreach needs fed back from other ~~storm water~~ Urban Runoff program elements. Federal regulation, 40 CFR 122.26(d)(v), requires the Permittees to conduct a program assessment to determine the reduction in ~~P~~ollutant loadings due to Urban Runoff management programs. Each Permittee is required to implement an assessment program, guided by the CASQA Guidance manual or equivalent alternative, to measure the change in behavior of its target communities to reduce discharge of ~~P~~ollutants to the MS4 and the environment.

Deleted: p

Deleted: p

#### K. PERMITTEE FACILITIES AND ACTIVITIES;

Federal regulation, 40 CFR 122.26(d)(iv)(A), requires the Permittees to ensure that ~~their public agency~~ activities and facilities do not cause or contribute to violations of ~~water quality standards~~ Water Quality Standards in ~~Receiving Waters~~ receiving waters. Education of Permittee planning, inspection, and maintenance staff is critical to ensure that Permittee facilities and activities do not cause or contribute to an exceedance of Receiving Water ~~quality standards~~ Quality Standards. The ~~third term 2002~~ MS4 ~~P~~ermit also specified minimum requirements for street sweeping and inspection and maintenance of drainage facilities. The Permittees were also required to develop and distribute BMP fact sheets for various ~~public agency~~ Permittee activities. Permittee as well as contract staff that perform Permittee activities were required to be properly trained. The second and third term MS4 ~~P~~ermits required the Permittees to prepare a Municipal Facilities Strategy

Deleted: p

Deleted: p

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009

(MFS) to ensure that ~~public agency Permittee~~ facilities and activities do not contribute ~~Pollutants to Receiving Waters. The MFS was incorporated into Section 5 of the DAMP during the third term MS4 Permit.~~ Each year, by August 1st, the Permittees are required to review their activities and facilities to determine the need for revisions to section 5 of the MFSDAMP.

Deleted: p

This Order continues and builds upon the requirement of the third term MS4 ~~Permit by requiring Permittees to include structural post-construction BMP~~ information for certain Permittee projects along with the Notice of Termination submitted to the Executive Officer upon completion of the construction activity. The Notice of Termination must include photographs of the completed project, a location map, and for public works projects subject to a WQMP, structural post-construction BMP location, field verification report and identify long term operation and maintenance responsibility. Permittees are required to develop a database of post-construction BMPs for which the Permittees are responsible and shall reference this database in the LIP.

Deleted: p

Program evaluations conducted during the third term MS4 ~~Permit~~ indicated varying degrees of compliance at Permittee facilities and activities. This Order requires each Permittee to inventory its fixed facilities, field operations and MS4 facilities to ensure that Permittee facilities do not cause or contribute to a ~~Pollution or Nuisance in Receiving Waters.~~ These facilities and field operations are to be prioritized for inspection according to threat to water quality.

Deleted: p

Deleted: p

Deleted: n

Fixed Permittee facilities and field operations include, but are not limited to fire training facilities, corporate yards, maintenance and storage yards, animal shelters, water treatment facilities, swimming pools, warehouses, and hazardous materials storage facilities, and recreation facilities. The Permittees are required to include in their LIP procedures and schedules for inspections and maintenance of Permittee facilities and activities. ~~Some of these facilities are Urban Runoff from other Permittee facilities, such as airports, wastewater treatment plants and landfills, is~~ regulated under the General Industrial Permit.

## L. PERMITTEE CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

The third term MS4 ~~Permit~~ authorized the discharge of storm water from construction activities on one acre or more that are under ownership or direct responsibility of the Permittees. The Permittees were required to notify the Executive Officer prior to commencement of construction activities, and to comply with the substantive requirements of the latest Statewide General Construction Activities Storm Water Permit.

Deleted: p

Program evaluations conducted during the third term MS4 ~~Permit~~ indicated that some of the Permittees were not submitting or were not aware of the requirement to

Deleted: p

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009.

submit a Notice of Intent and a Notice of Completion for Permittee construction projects.

#### **M. TRAINING PROGRAM FOR STORM WATER MANAGERS, PLANNERS, INSPECTORS ~~And~~ AND PERMITTEE CONTRACTORS**

Education of ~~municipal~~ Permittee planning, inspection, and maintenance staff is ~~critical~~ important to ensure that land use decisions, local permit approvals and Permittee facilities and activities do not cause or contribute to an exceedance of Receiving Water ~~quality standards~~ Quality Standards. During ~~third~~ the term ~~of the~~ 2002 MS4 Permit, the Permittees attended training classes specific to major ~~storm-water~~ Stormwater Runoff program elements including New Development/Significant Redevelopment, construction and industrial inspections, and Permittee activities.

This Order requires the Permittees , in conjunction with a broader array of MS4 Programs or CASQA, to define the ~~necessary expertise and competencies for various job functions involved in the~~ program implementation ~~training needs for of the area-wide and local~~ Urban Runoff program staff, including contractors, managers and inspectors ~~management programs and to develop an appropriate curriculum.~~ The training curriculum must be designed for Permittee facilities and field operations staff, Permittee inspection staff, ~~storm-water~~ Urban Runoff program managers and those involved in the review and approval of WQMPs and CEQA documents, including Permittee contractors. The audits of the Permittees indicated the need for better inter-departmental collaboration and communication in the local Urban Runoff program implementation. ~~The training curriculum needs to address effective communication~~ This Order requires LIPs to develop and document processes and procedures for coordination between planners, plan reviewers, engineers and inspectors to ensure that appropriate post-construction BMPs are approved, installed, and are operational.

#### **N. NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS**

Most of the notification requirements that were spread throughout the third term MS4 ~~P~~ permit were consolidated into one section.

Deleted: p

#### **O. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT/DAMP REVIEW**

The DAMP is a management document that needs to be updated with the new requirements of this Order.

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009



## P. FISCAL RESOURCES

Each Permittee ~~shall~~ is expected to exercise its full authority to secure the resources necessary to meet all requirements of this Order. See Section IX for existing funding mechanisms and potential limitations to Permittee funding ~~submit a financial summary to the Executive Officer of the Regional Board.~~

Deleted:

## Q. MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

During the first term MS4 ~~P~~ Permit and part of the second term MS4 ~~P~~ Permit, the Permittees conducted monitoring of the ~~storm water~~ Urban Runoff flows, Receiving Water quality, and sediment quality. The Santa Ana Phase I NPDES Monitoring Program began in November 1991 with 27 monitoring sites. The program has been reduced in phases to more specifically address Urban Runoff program needs and to redirect monitoring resources to TMDL-related activities.

Deleted: p

Deleted: p

There was a time where samples were collected on a rotational basis with no consistent monitoring from year to year. On April 14, 2003, with the submittal of an Interim Monitoring Program, monitoring at seven core sampling locations (Sampling Stations 040, 316, 318, 364, 702, 707, and 752) was established that provided representative and consistent monitoring results for the Permit Area.

The Riverside County monitoring programs, as well as other monitoring programs nationwide, have shown that there is a high degree of uncertainty in the quality of Urban Runoff and that there are significant variations in the quality of Urban Runoff spatially and temporally. However, most of the monitoring programs to date have indicated that there are a number of ~~P~~ pollutants in Urban Runoff. A ~~definite~~ link between ~~P~~ pollutants in Urban Runoff and Beneficial Use ~~I~~mpairments has been established in a few studies.

Deleted: p

Deleted: p

Deleted: i

This Order requires the Permittees identified as TMDL stakeholders in an approved TMDL to continue to comply with applicable TMDL Implementation Plan requirements, including monitoring requirements, and to implement Urban TMDL WLAs through an iterative BMP approach (see Section V.C above) ~~participate in monitoring programs to support TMDL development and implementation. Specific implementation programs exist for the Middle Santa Ana River and Canyon Lake/Lake Elsinore TMDLs. Monitoring strategies shall be revised as necessary to evaluate the impacts of Urban Runoff on identified impairments within the Permit Area and the tributary 303(d) listed waterbodies.~~

~~The Implementation Plans for the Middle Santa Ana River Bacterial Indicator TMDL and Canyon Lake/Lake Elsinore Nutrient TMDL requires the Permittees to comply with TMDL Implementation Plan and to revise the DAMP to incorporate BMPs in the Permittees stormwater programs. This Order requires the Permittees to monitor the effectiveness of the BMPs specified in the TMDL Implementation Plan and the BMPs implemented as part of the DAMP, the LIP~~

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009



~~and this Order in reducing bacteria and nutrient, respectively, to meet the WLAs at representative urban runoff discharge monitoring locations by the compliance dates.~~ Wet and dry seasons are defined differently by the various monitoring programs included in this Order. The Middle Santa Ana TMDL defines the wet season as November 1 through March 31<sup>st</sup> and the Canyon Lake/Lake Elsinore TMDL monitoring defines it as October 1<sup>st</sup> through May 31<sup>st</sup>. The Monitoring and Reporting Program for this Order generally defines the Wet Season as October 1st through May 31st. Monitoring required under this Order is expected to be conducted consistent with the applicable seasonal definitions. ~~All TMDL monitoring shall continue to be conducted based on the approved implementation plans.~~

Deleted:

The MSAR Bacterial Indicator TMDL and Canyon Lake/Lake Elsinore Nutrient TMDL requires the Permittees to comply with TMDL Implementation Plan requirements to revise the DAMP to incorporate BMPs in the Permittees Urban Runoff programs. This Order requires the Permittees to evaluate the effectiveness of the BMPs implemented as part of the DAMP in conformance with the TMDL Implementation Plan requirements.

This MS4 monitoring program includes sampling Urban Runoff at a variety of sites located throughout the Permit Area for three storm events per year. Urban Runoff samples will be collected and analyzed for a variety of constituents. In addition to these efforts, the Permittees are reevaluating their overall Urban Runoff monitoring program to determine its effectiveness in meeting the following objectives:

1. Assess rates of mass loading
2. Assess influence of land use on water quality
3. Assess compliance with ~~water quality objectives~~ Water Quality Objectives
4. Assess effectiveness of water quality controls
5. Detect ~~illicit connections and illegal discharges~~ IC/IDs
6. Identify problem areas and/or trends
7. Identify ~~P~~ Pollutants of ~~C~~ Concern
8. Identify baseline conditions
9. Establish/maintain a water quality database

Deleted: p

Deleted: c

To accomplish these goals, the following activities are conducted:

1. Collect water quality data
2. Collect rainfall/runoff data
3. Establish quality assurance/control procedures
4. Conduct data analysis and archiving
5. Install and maintain appropriate equipment
6. Prepare an Annual Report

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

RCFC&WCD, in its role as Principal Permittee, participates in the SMC and other task forces. The goal of the SMC is to develop the technical information necessary

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009

to better understand storm water mechanisms and impacts, and then develop the tools that will effectively and efficiently improve storm water decision-making. Some of the cooperative monitoring efforts conducted through the SMC and other task forces include Comparative Evaluation of Microbial Source Tracking Techniques, Model Monitoring Program Guidance, Peak Flow Study, and Laboratory Inter-Calibration Studies. Under the auspices of the SMC, SCCWRP prepared “Model Monitoring Program for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems in Southern California”, August 2004 Technical Report No. 419. This report noted, “...the lack of mass emissions stations in the inland counties hampers their ability to estimate the proportional contribution of these inland areas to cumulative loads downstream.” The SMC consists of representatives from the Counties of Ventura, Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, and San Diego and the Cities of Long Beach, and Los Angeles, the Los Angeles, Santa Ana and San Diego Regional Boards, the State Board, SCCWRP, Caltrans, and the USEPA. This Order requires the Permittees to continue mass emissions monitoring to determine ~~P~~ollutant loading.

Deleted: p

During the second and third term MS4 ~~P~~ermits, there was an increased focus on watershed management initiatives and coordination among the MS4 permittees in Orange, Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. The MS4 permittees participated in a number of regional monitoring programs and other coordinated program and policy developments, such as the Regional Integrated Freshwater Bioassessment Monitoring Program, and the BMP Effectiveness Assessment. The Principal Permittee continues to be an active participant in the ~~Storm Water Quality Standards Task Force (SWQSTF), Middle Santa Ana River (MSAR)~~ Bacterial Indicator TMDL, Canyon Lake/Lake Elsinore (San Jacinto) Nutrient TMDL and the SMC. This Order recommends the Permittees continue their participation in these types of watershed coordination efforts and provides them with opportunities to use these efforts to comply with applicable requirements of the Permit.

Deleted: p

The third term MS4 ~~P~~ermit required the Permittees to initiate bioassessment monitoring. To allow for a holistic approach, this Order requires the Permittees to participate in the Regional Integrated Freshwater Bioassessment Monitoring Program in lieu of a separate bioassessment monitoring program for the Permit Area.

Deleted: p

This Order requires the Permittees to re-evaluate their CMP and submit a revised plan for approval. The revised CMP should integrate the goals and objectives of the Watershed Action Plan and rectify data gaps from previous monitoring efforts.

## **R. PROVISIONS – Standard Language per NPDES regulations.**

## **S. PERMIT MODIFICATION– Standard Language per NPDES regulations.**

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

~~Tentative Second~~ Public Draft  
~~October 22, 2009~~

## T. PERMIT EXPIRATION AND RENEWAL– Standard Language per NPDES regulations.

## IX. WATER QUALITY BENEFITS, COST ANALYSIS, AND FISCAL ANALYSIS

There are direct and indirect benefits from clean lakes and beaches, clean water, and a clean environment. It is difficult to assign a dollar value to the benefits the public derives from fishable and swimmable waters. In 1972, at the start of the NPDES program, only 1/3 of the U.S. waters were swimmable and fishable. In 2008, more than 2/3 of the U.S. waters met these criteria. In the 1999 “*Money*” magazine survey of the “Best Places to Live”, clean water and air ranked as two of the most important factors in choosing a place to live. Thus environmental quality has a definite link to property values.

The true magnitude of the Urban Runoff problem is still elusive and any cost estimate for cleaning up Urban Runoff would be premature short of end-of-pipe treatments. For Urban Runoff, end-of-pipe treatments are cost prohibitive and are not generally considered as a technologically feasible option. Over the last decade, the Permittees have attempted to define the problem and implemented BMPs to the MEP to combat the problem.

The costs incurred by the Permittees in implementing these programs and policies can be divided into three broad categories:

- A. Shared costs: These are costs that fund activities performed mostly by the Principal Permittee under the Implementation Agreement. These activities include overall storm water program coordination; intergovernmental agreements; representation at the ~~Storm Water Quality Standards Task Force~~ SWQSTF, Regional Board/State Board meetings and other public forums; preparation and submittal of compliance reports and other reports required under the NPDES permits, responding to Water Code Section 13267 requests, budget and other program documentation; coordination of consultant studies, Co-Permittee meetings, and training seminars.
- B. Individual Costs for DAMP Implementation: These are costs incurred by each Permittee for implementing the BMPs (drainage facility inspections for ~~illicit~~ Connections, drain inlet/catch basin stenciling, public education, etc.) included in the DAMP. A number of programs and policies for ~~non-point~~ Non-Point and ~~storm water pollution~~ Urban Runoff Pollution controls existed prior to the MS4 permit program. However, the DAMP that was developed and implemented in response to the MS4 ~~permit program~~ Permit required additional programs and policies for ~~pollution~~ Urban Runoff Pollution control.
- C. Individual Costs of Pre-Existing Programs: These are costs incurred by each Permittee for water ~~P~~ ollution control measures which were already in existence

Deleted: i

Deleted: c

Deleted: p

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009

prior to the MS4 permit program. These programs included recycling, litter control, street sweeping, drainage facility maintenance, and emergency spill response.

Historically, the Permittees have employed four distinct funding methods to finance their NPDES Activities. Many Permittees utilize a combination of these funding sources. The different methods include:

A. Santa Ana Watershed Benefit Assessment Area

In 1991, the RCFC&WCD established the Santa Ana Watershed Benefit Assessment Area (SAWBAA) to fund its NPDES activities. Currently, SAWBAA revenues fund both area-wide NPDES program activities and the RCFC&WCD's individual MS4 permit compliance activities.

B. County Service Area 152

In December 1991, the County of Riverside formed County Service Area 152 (CSA 152) to provide funding for compliance activities associated with its NPDES permit activities. Under the laws that govern CSAs, sub-areas may be established within the overall CSA area with different assessment rates set within each sub-area. The cities of Corona, Moreno Valley, Norco, Riverside, Lake Elsinore and San Jacinto elected to participate in CSA 152.

C. Utility Charge

The City of Hemet funds a portion of its NPDES program activities through a utility charge.

D. General Fund /Other Revenues

Deleted: ¶

Permittees also utilize general fund revenue to finance their NPDES activities. Several Permittees also report using general fund and other revenue sources (e.g., gas taxes, developer fees, etc.) to fund a portion of their Urban Runoff management activities.

The Annual Report provides the most recent budgets and expenditure projections available for the costs incurred by the Permittees in implementing these programs and policies. The following information, in parenthesis, on the current economic conditions was provided by the Permittees.

**Current Economic Conditions**

**The following information was provided by the Permittees and does not constitute a finding by the Regional Board:**

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009

Historically, the Permittees have employed several funding methods to finance their MS4 Permit compliance activities. Unfortunately, the mortgage crisis, collapse of the housing market and the economic recession has resulted in the cessation of virtually all development activity and has significantly reduced sales tax revenue. Property tax revenues have been reduced by the high level of foreclosure activity and reduced property values. Property tax revenues have been further reduced by homeowner requests for reassessments to reflect the reduced property values. The impact of these economic conditions on the Permittees in the Santa Ana Region has been particularly severe. As a result, funds typically provided by these funding methods has been severely reduced, and it is anticipated that this condition will continue for an indefinite period. The funding methods historically used and the effects of the economic situation on the availability of funds through these sources are summarized as follows:

- Santa Ana Watershed Benefit Assessment Area. In 1991, the District established the Santa Ana Watershed Benefit Assessment Area to fund its MS4 Permit compliance activities. Currently, the Benefit Assessment revenues fund the District's share of the area-wide MS4 Permit program activities and the District's individual compliance activities as a Permittee. Under the Benefit Assessment each parcel is taxed based on the impervious area of each parcel at a set rate established through Proposition 218. This rate has not been increased since 1991 and increases in revenues have resulted from increases in the number of contributing parcels resulting from New Development. In 2007/08 the Santa Ana Benefit Assessment generated approximately \$2,030,000 in revenue. These revenues are used to fund the District's compliance activities and the bulk of the administrative costs associated with the District's duties as Principal Permittee.

Outlook: The District expects at best to maintain, if not see temporary reductions in Benefit Assessment revenues due to the significant number of homes that are not paying property tax due to foreclosure. An increase in the established Benefit Assessment rate to compensate for these reductions would require approval of 2/3 of the voters or 50% of the property owners and is unlikely, especially in the current economic climate. An increase in the number of contributing parcels will not occur until the development industry recovers.

- General Fund/Other Revenues. The County and the Cities utilize general fund revenue to finance most of their MS4 Permit compliance activities. General fund revenue is generated by property tax, sales tax, and auto license taxes.

Outlook: The Permittees expect a continued reduction in the funds available through General Fund/Other Revenues through at least FY 2009/2010. Although optimistic that conditions will begin to stabilize toward the end of 2009, the Permittees cannot speculate as to when revenues will recover to previous levels. Historically, the Permittees have investigated other funding sources,

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

including a phone survey conducted by LESJWA with support from the District and the County of Riverside to evaluate the possibility of passing a new assessment to fund water quality improvements benefiting Lake Elsinore. The results of the survey found insufficient voter support for water quality related issues to move forward with a special election. The Permittees have also formed a finance committee which has met several times to obtain information about actions that they can take to maximize revenues and potential alternative funding sources. These efforts met with some success, particularly in relation to maximizing fees for service; however significant new funding sources were not identified or available to the Permittees even during the more favorable economic conditions experienced during the term of the 2002 Riverside County MS4 Permit.

- Fees. Several Permittees charge fees for services such as inspections, plan check and other recoverable costs related to compliance with the 2002 Riverside County MS4 Permit. These fees cover both the direct and indirect costs associated with conducting these inspections/reviews including associated compliance tracking and reporting.

Outlook: It is notable that, with the virtual collapse of the development industry in the Santa Ana Region, the fees received by the Permittees for review of New Developments and construction inspections have been significantly reduced. With this reduced level of fee-based income, maintenance of the existing inspection and plan review programs will place a burden on overall funding of the compliance programs. The Permittees do not expect revenues from fees to recover until the development industry recovers. Even with recovery of the development industry, it is anticipated that revenues from fees will be reduced for the majority of the Cities within the Santa Ana Region and the County due to the reduced area remaining for development in their jurisdictions.

Deleted: n

Deleted: d

- Grants. The Permittees have actively pursued and, as available, used grants to fund compliance programs.

Outlook: In December the State's budget crisis resulted in a directive to State agencies from the Department of Finance to halt projects that rely on bond funds, including those funded by Proposition 40, Proposition 50 or Proposition 84. The State of California is the primary source of grant funding for water quality projects. Future availability of funds to resume compliance projects funded by grants is uncertain.

It is clear that the current economic climate and that of the foreseeable future is creating a significant burden upon the Permittees that will make the continuance of all existing MS4 Permit compliance programs difficult. If new funding sources or alternative combinations of funding sources cannot be identified, it is likely that compliance program funding will be reduced.

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009




## Economic Projections

According to Chicago Title, Southwest Riverside County has experienced a very significant increase in supply of single-family residential units on the market. As a result, housing price indicators are very negative. In the majority of the Southwest Riverside submarket, the pending price is less than closing price that suggests the weakness of the market. The October 2008 count of bank owned (REO) properties for Riverside County as a whole was 12,078. The number of foreclosures was 23,480. The presence of high levels of REO properties will continue to negatively affect the price line. In addition, the level of foreclosures is increasing. At the end of January 2009, 68% of the homes listed for sale are foreclosures or short sales.<sup>12</sup>

With regard to other sectors of the economy, Riverside County has taken a serious turn for the worst in 2008, with projections indicating that the severe downturn will continue through 2009 at the very least. The economic difficulties being faced in the Southwest Riverside submarket is the result of the dramatic downturn in the housing market in this area, the national financial turmoil, the worldwide credit crisis, and the increasing consumer debt crisis. According to Beacon Economics, a respected economics consulting firm in Los Angeles, Inland Southern California is clearly at the epicenter of this economic turmoil, with extremely high rates of unemployment at present. Unemployment rates in Inland Southern California are expected to reach 12.4% (Riverside County beat that – unemployment was 13.7% in June 2009 – California Employment Development Department) before this deep recession is over. Housing prices are expected to continue their precipitous decline from their peak levels in the two Inland Southern California counties through at least 2011. According to Dataquick, median home prices in Riverside County peaked at \$415,000 in January 2007. At the end of this cycle, the median home price in Riverside County is expected to be \$198,000. Figure 1 depicts the median housing price in Riverside County over the period 1990 to August 2008.

<sup>12</sup> Orange County Register, January 27, 2009, p. 11.

Figure 1. Riverside County Median Housing Price (1990 – August 2008)



Source: Riverside County Center for Demographic Research. 2008. Riverside County Progress Report, pg 14.

Local Government sales tax revenues remained fairly stagnant through 2006 and began to decline in early 2007, according to Beacon. By the second quarter of 2008, the taxable sales in Riverside County declined by 7.7%. This will continue with taxable sales possibly bottoming out by 2010. These shocks are expected to continue and accelerate within the southwest Riverside County economy.

As a direct outcome of the current economy and the economic outlook into the term of the 2009 Riverside County MS4 Permit, the number of New Development proposals has plummeted and any significant rebound is not forecast. New and redevelopment projects will likely remain minimal. As shown in Figure 2, the number of housing units being added each year has dropped below the levels seen at any point in time during the 2002 Riverside County MS4 Permit. These numbers will likely continue to decrease for a significant portion of the new 2009 Riverside County MS4 Permit term.


Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009

**Deleted:** Preliminary First

**Deleted:** October 22, 2009

**Deleted:** July 23, 2009

Figure 2. Riverside County Housing Units Added (1990 – 2008)



Source: Riverside County Center for Demographic Research. 2008. Riverside County Progress Report, pg 12.

These economic issues and projections directly affect and limit both:

- The need for including enhanced New Development and Significant Re-development requirements in the 2009 Riverside County MS4 Permit, and
- The Permittees ability to fund, and even seek new funding sources for additional MS4 Permit requirements for New Development and Significant Re-development projects.

Permittee specific projections are as follows:

#### County of Riverside

The County is operating with a structural deficit of \$12 million and plans a 25% budget reduction from FY 2008/2009 through FY 2011/2012. The County's current budget of \$4.7 billion represents a 5% reduction from the previous year and next year's budget is expected to be cut by 10%. These cuts are directly associated with the decline in property values caused by the high number of foreclosures. There are concerns about having to use discretionary funds to meet State mental health and social service mandates. In addition, the County is dependent on funds from Federal and State sources. If during this time of economic crisis Federal and State funding sources are reduced or eliminated, any unfunded programs will be terminated. Only core County programs will continue.

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

The primary source of general fund revenue is from property taxes and sales tax. With the unprecedented number of foreclosures, reduced property values, and declining sales, general fund revenue is in a downward spiral. Another source of funding is through the Solid Waste Tipping Fees paid at the County landfills. Volume is down 15% since 2006 with anticipated downward trend to 40% reduction in solid waste through 2014. Programs that are partially funded through tipping fee allotments will be impacted. Due to the declining economy the recycling market has collapsed. Virtually no recyclable materials are being shipped for reprocessing. This loss of revenue and increased disposal costs is further impacting the general fund.

Cuts of 25% for all Net County Cost general fund programs will translate into reduction of County services and elimination of unfunded State and Federal programs. Only core value programs will be provided (including public safety and fee programs).

The County has instituted a hiring freeze and required each department to create a report outlining the projected effects of the budget cuts. The County currently employs over 20,000 people, and layoffs are expected to result from the findings of these departmental reports. It is anticipated that this will impact program delivery for stormwater related activities. No County department will be able to sustain current staffing levels as they try to meet the 25% budget reduction strategy.<sup>13 14</sup>

#### City of Menifee

The newly incorporated City of Menifee FY 2008/2009 initial budget was estimated from their comprehensive fiscal analysis that was submitted to the Local Agency Formation Commission during the incorporation process. Because of the economic uncertainty, and the fact that the City is only now beginning to staff positions, it is unknown what the immediate impact of the fiscal crisis will be. The County is responsible for assisting the City in meeting its MS4 Permit compliance requirements during the first year of incorporation which expires October 1, 2009. Currently, the level of property tax revenue that will be available to the City is uncertain. Funding for MS4 Permit compliance requirements was not explicitly budgeted. A financial hardship currently exists because of the costs associated with incorporation.

#### City of Murrieta

The City of Murrieta's FY 2008/2009 budget did not increase compared to FY 2007/2008. The City has identified a \$3.3 million budget shortfall for the current fiscal year ending on June 30, 2009. This represents approximately 8.2% of the City's projected revenue which must be absorbed in five months.

<sup>13</sup> "The Realities of Recession in California: A Statewide Report by U.S. Senator Barbara Boxer, December, 2008, p. 18.

<sup>14</sup> Riverside County Executive Office, January, 2008.

**Tentative Second** Public Draft

**October 22, 2009**

**Deleted:** Preliminary First

**Deleted:** October 22, 2009

**Deleted:** July 23, 2009

The shortfalls are primarily due to reduced sales tax and property tax revenues. Department heads are currently working on revised budgets to adjust for the loss in revenue.

Additional, budget cuts are anticipated for FY 2009/2010 because the immediate economic outlook is not good. There have been approximately 2,000 home foreclosures within the City. Sales tax revenue is estimated to drop 12.5%, property tax revenue will drop, and the State took approximately \$525,000 out of redevelopment funds. Murrieta did not receive any vehicle licensing fees from the State and it appears likely that the State will take more revenue from the Cities to solve its budget problems. New NPDES requirements that increase compliance costs will create a financial hardship for the City.

#### City of Riverside

The City of Riverside has seen declining general fund revenue over the last two fiscal years in virtually all categories. The City's most recent projection indicates that total general fund revenues for the current fiscal year will be under \$200 million, down from a budget of \$215 million as adopted, and \$226.5 million in the prior fiscal year. This represents a decline over two fiscal years of approximately 12%. Specifically, property tax and sales tax revenue continue their decline, which is primarily attributable to decreased residential construction activity and in the case of sales tax declining automobile sales.

The decline in revenue has resulted in a corresponding reduction to general fund expenditures. Specifically, approximately 12% of the positions authorized for the general fund have been vacated and unfunded, either through transferring staff to other funds, attrition or limited layoffs of temporary and contract staff. Additionally, the level of service provided to the community in virtually all City departments has been reduced through funding reductions to items such as street maintenance, recreation programs and libraries, though great care has been taken to minimize the impact of cuts to the public. It is anticipated that in the near term the economic situation will not improve, and staff is preparing a budget for the upcoming fiscal year that anticipates further decreases in revenue.

#### City of Wildomar

The newly incorporated City of Wildomar FY 2008/2009 initial budget was estimated from their comprehensive fiscal analysis that was submitted to the Local Agency Formation Commission during the incorporation process. Because of the economic uncertainty, and the fact that the City is only now beginning to staff positions, it is unknown what the immediate impact of the fiscal crisis will be. The County is responsible for assisting the City in meeting its MS4 Permit compliance requirements the first year of incorporation that expires July 1, 2009. Currently, the level of property tax revenue that will be

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

available to the City is uncertain. Funding for MS4 Permit compliance requirements was not explicitly budgeted. A financial hardship currently exists because of the costs associated with incorporation.}

#### **X. ANTIDEGRADATION ANALYSIS**

The Regional Board has considered whether a complete antidegradation analysis, pursuant to 40 CFR 131.12 and State Board Resolution No. 68-16, is required for these Urban Runoff discharges. The Regional Board finds that the Pollutant loading rates to the Receiving Waters will be reduced with the implementation of the requirements in this Order. As a result, the quality of Urban Runoff discharges and Receiving Waters will be improved, thereby improving protection for the Beneficial Uses of Waters of the U.S. Since this Order will not result in a lowering of water quality, a complete antidegradation analysis is not necessary, consistent with the federal and state antidegradation requirements.

Deleted: p

#### **XI. PUBLIC WORKSHOP**

Regional Board proposes to conduct at least one public workshop and a subsequent public hearing. The first workshop to review the proposed Order and to get public comments is scheduled as follows:

Date and time: August 3, 2009; meeting starts at 9:00 a.m.

Location: City of Loma Linda, Council Chambers  
25541 Barton Road  
Loma Linda, CA

Deleted: Preliminary First

Deleted: October 22, 2009

Deleted: July 23, 2009

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009



The details regarding any subsequent workshops and the public hearing to consider adoption of the proposed Order will be posted on the Regional Board's website at:

[http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana/water\\_issues/programs/stormwater/riverside\\_permit.shtml](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana/water_issues/programs/stormwater/riverside_permit.shtml)

This information may be also obtained by calling the Regional Board office at 951-782-4130.

The Regional Board recognizes the significance of Riverside County's Storm Water/Clean Water Protection Program and will conduct, participate, and/or assist with at any workshop during the term of this Order to promote and discuss the requirements of this Order and the progress of the Urban Runoff management program. The details of the public workshops will be posted on the Regional Board's website indicated above. Persons wishing to be included in the mailing list for any of the items related to this permit may register their name, mailing address and phone number with the Regional Board office at the address given below.

## **XII. PUBLIC HEARING**

The Regional Board will hold a public hearing regarding the proposed waste discharge requirements. A Notice of Public Hearing will be also published in the Legal Notices section of a local newspaper. The public hearing on this item is scheduled for December 10, 2009 at the City Council Chambers, City of Corona. Additional information regarding the public hearing will also be posted on the website indicated above. Further information regarding the conduct and nature of the public hearing concerning these waste discharge requirements may be obtained by writing or visiting the Santa Ana Regional Board office, 3737 Main Street, Suite 500, Riverside, CA 92501. This and other information are also available at the website at: [www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana).

**Deleted:** will be scheduled at a later time, information re

## **XIII. INFORMATION AND COPYING**

Persons wishing further information may write to the above address or call Keith Elliott at (951) 782-4925. Copies of the application, proposed waste discharge requirements, and other documents (other than those which the Executive Officer maintains as confidential) are available at the Regional Board office for inspection and copying by appointment scheduled between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday (excluding holidays, and furlough days).

## **XIV. REGISTER OF INTERESTED PERSONS**

Any person interested in a particular application or group for applications may leave his name, address and phone number as part of the file for an application. Copies

**Deleted:** Preliminary First

**Deleted:** October 22, 2009

**Deleted:** July 23, 2009

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009

of tentative waste discharge requirements will be available on the web for all interested parties to download.

E-mail registration:

[http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/resources/email\\_subscriptions/reg8\\_subscribe.shtml](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/resources/email_subscriptions/reg8_subscribe.shtml)

## XV. RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommendation is to adopt the tentative Order, Order No. R8-2009-0033, as presented.

**Deleted:** At the August 3, 2009 Public Workshop, the Board will not take any action on the proposed O

**Deleted:** .

Tentative Second Public Draft  
October 22, 2009

**Deleted:** Preliminary First

**Deleted:** October 22, 2009

**Deleted:** July 23, 2009